

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RONALD ADAMS,)	2:07-cv-00777-HDM-RAM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER
vs.)	
)	
C. GIBSON, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

On March 3, 2010, the defendants consented to the United State Magistrate Judge's consideration of this matter for all purposes pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1) (#52). Before that time, plaintiff had filed conflicting documents, one consenting to the magistrate judge's jurisdiction (#4), and the other declining to consent (#50). Because of the inconsistency between the forms, the court granted plaintiff an opportunity to advise whether he did or did not consent to the reassignment of this matter to the magistrate judge. On March 23, 2010, the plaintiff filed a

1 declaration indicating that he had intended to consent but had
2 mistakenly signed in the "decline" portion of the form (#58).
3 Therefore, it appears to the court that all parties to this action
4 have consented to the jurisdiction of the magistrate judge.
5 Accordingly, pursuant to § 636(c)(1), the clerk of the court shall
6 reassign this action to the United States Magistrate Judge for a
7 full disposition of the matter.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: This 30th day of March, 2010.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE