

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

TERRANCE MARSH, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FREEDOM MORTGAGE CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:23-cv-01451-JLT-EPG

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO E-FILE
DOCUMENTS

(ECF No. 36)

Plaintiffs Terrance Marsh and Gesele Marsh proceed *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil action. (ECF Nos. 1, 7, 9). They move for permission to electronically file (e-file) documents in this case, stating that e-filing is easier, faster, and less expensive than filing documents via in-person and the mail. (ECF No. 36).

Under the Court's Local Rules, *pro se* parties are required to "file and serve paper documents" and "may not utilize electronic filing except with the permission of the assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge." Local Rule 133(b)(2) (emphasis omitted). Any request for an exception to this rule must be submitted as a stipulation between the parties or a "written motion[] setting out an explanation of reasons for the exception." Local Rule 133(b)(3). It is within the Court's discretion to grant or deny such a request. *Reddy v. Precyse Solutions LLC*, 2013 WL 2603413, at *3 (E.D. Cal. June 11, 2013).

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

On December 16, 2024, the Court issued an order noting that Plaintiffs’ motion did not make clear whether Plaintiffs are familiar with the requirements applicable to e-filing in this Court or whether they have the necessary hardware and software needed for e-filing. (ECF No. 38). The Court gave Plaintiffs ten days from the date of entry of the order to each file a separate declaration in support of their request for permission to use the Court’s e-filing system, noting that the declaration should address whether they aware of the requirements for e-filing and whether they have access to the necessary hardware and software.

The deadline for Plaintiffs to file a declaration has expired, and they have not filed one or any other response to the Court’s order.

Based on Plaintiffs’ failure to comply with the Court’s order and failure to properly support their motion, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion to e-file documents (ECF No. 36) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 8, 2025

/s/ Eric P. Gray
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE