

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PETER STROJNIK, SR.,
Plaintiff,

v.

THE VICTUS GROUP, INC. dba SIERRA
SKY RANCH,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:18-cv-01620-AWI-SKO

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR
PERMISSION TO FILE
ELECTRONICALLY**

(Doc. 6)

Before the Court is Plaintiff Peter Strojnik, Sr.’s Motion for Permission for Electronic Case Filing (the “Motion”). (Doc. 6.) Local Rule 133(b)(2) provides that “[a]ny person appearing pro se may *not* utilize electronic filing except with the permission of the assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge.” Instead, “[a]ll parties shall file and serve paper documents as required by applicable Federal Rules of Civil . . . Procedure or by these [Local] Rules.” E.D. Cal. Local Rule 133(b)(2). Nonetheless, a pro se party may “[r]equest to use paper or electronic filing as exceptions from these Rules” if (1) they submit a stipulation between the parties “as provided in [Local Rule] 143;” or (2) “if a stipulation cannot be had,” by a “written motion[] setting out an explanation of reasons for the exception.” E.D. Cal. Local Rule 133(b)(3).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Here, the Motion is neither stipulated to by the defendant, nor does it set forth an explanation of the reasons for the exception. The Court therefore finds that it is inappropriate in this matter to depart from the Local Rule that “[a]ny person appearing pro se may not utilize electronic filing.” E.D. Cal. Local Rule 133(b)(2). Accordingly, the Court DENIES the Motion (Doc. 6), subject to renewal upon a showing of sufficient reason to justify deviating from Local Rule 133(b)(2).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 17, 2019

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE