

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES E. BOWELL,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-0397 JAM DAD (PC)

vs.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_/

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed with this action in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

On March 3, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for a court-appointed investigator. The expenditure of public funds on behalf of an indigent litigant is proper only when authorized by Congress. Tedder v. Odel, 890 F.2d 210 (9th Cir. 1989). The in forma pauperis statute does not authorize the expenditure of public funds for investigators. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

/////  
/////  
/////  
/////

1                   Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's March 3, 2011 motion  
2 for a court-appointed investigator is denied.

3 DATED: March 9, 2011.

4  
5                     
6                   \_\_\_\_\_  
7                   DALE A. DROZD  
8                   UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 <sup>12</sup>  
9 bowe0397.31c

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