1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ZABIHOLLAH NAJAFIANASHRAFI,	Case No. 1:24-cv-00336-KES-BAM
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
13	v.	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE THROUGH THE COURT'S E-FILING PROGRAM (Doc. 15)
14	MERRICK B. GARLAND, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff Zabihollah Najafianashrafi, proceeding pro se, initiated this action on April 9,	
18	2024 against Defendants Merrick B. Garland, Alejandro Mayorkas, Ur Mendoza Jaddou, and	
19	Christopher A. Wray. (Doc. 1.) On September 19, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Second Amended	
20	Complaint. (Doc. 12.) On September 23, 2024, Plaintiff filed the instant request for permission	
21	to file documents electronically through the e-filing system. (Doc. 15.)	
22	Pursuant to the Local Rules, a pro se party shall file and serve paper documents and may	
23	not utilize electronic filing unless granted permission by the Court. L.R. 133(a)-(b). A pro se	
24	party may request an exception to the paper filing requirement from the Court by filing a	
25	stipulation of the parties, or "if a stipulation cannot be had, [a] written motion[] setting out an	
26	explanation of reasons for the exception." L.R. 133(b)(3).	
27	Plaintiff states that e-filing through PACER would allow him to manage his case more	
28	efficiently and would allow him to receive timely notifications of court filings and orders and	

facilitate more effective case management. (Doc. 15.) Plaintiff does not further explain why an exception is warranted. (See Doc. 15.) Upon review of the pleadings in this action and the instant request, the Court finds that this action currently does not warrant an exception to the Local Rule. Documents intended to be filed with the Court must be mailed to the Clerk of the Court. See Local Rule 134(a). Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for permission to utilize electronic filing is DENIED without prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/Barbara A. McAuliffe Dated: September 24, 2024