1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 JEREMY L. JAMISON, No. 2:13-cv-01705 AC P 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. **ORDER** 14 SAMBRAJYA PALAGUMMI, 15 Defendant. 16 17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, seeks relief pursuant to 42 U.S. § 1983. 18 Pending before the court is plaintiff's motion to recall his consent to allow the magistrate judge to 19 oversee all further proceedings. ECF No. 46. 20 I. **Procedural History** 21 On August 23, 2013, just four days after the instant civil rights action was commenced, 22 plaintiff filed an election regarding consent to proceed before a Magistrate Judge in accordance 23 with 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) and Rule 73(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. ECF No. 6. The 24 election document was a form containing notice to the parties that they could voluntarily consent 25 to the jurisdiction of a United States Magistrate Judge to conduct all proceedings in the case, 26 including dispositive matters and entry of final judgment. Id. However, it was further stated that 27 if a party declines to consent a Magistrate Judge would continue to perform all duties as required 28 by Eastern District Local Rule 302. Id. In the portion of the form in which plaintiff was directed 1

to check the box indicating his decision regarding consent, plaintiff signed his name underneath the statement indicating that "[t]he undersigned hereby voluntarily consents to have a United States Magistrate Judge conduct all further proceedings in this case." <u>Id.</u>

II. Motion to Withdraw Consent

Plaintiff alleges in his motion that he suffers from bipolar disorder and depression and that he did not fully understand what consenting to magistrate judge jurisdiction for all further proceedings meant. ECF No. 45 at 1-2. He requests that the case be assigned to a district judge for a jury trial and that he be appointed counsel due to his mental health status. <u>Id.</u>

III. Analysis

Once a civil case is referred to a Magistrate Judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), the reference can be withdrawn only "for good cause shown on its own motion, or under extraordinary circumstances shown by any party." 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(4); Dixon v. Ylst, 990 F.2d 478, 480 (9th Cir. 1993) (stating that "[t]here is no absolute right, in a civil case, to withdraw consent to trial and other proceedings before a magistrate judge."). A referral to a magistrate judge will not be vacated where a party has consented in a signed writing to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction, the party fails to make a motion to vacate the reference that is supported by a showing of extraordinary circumstances, and the Court does not sua sponte find good cause for withdrawal of consent. Id.

Here, the Court finds that plaintiff's consent to the jurisdiction of a United States Magistrate Judge to conduct all further proceedings in the case, including the entry of final judgment, by manifesting his express consent in writing is binding. No good cause for withdrawal of consent appears on the basis of plaintiff's motion. Nowhere in his motion does plaintiff explain how his mental health condition affects or limits his understanding of written documents or his ability to make decisions for himself. Under the circumstances, the Court concludes that plaintiff has not established good cause to withdraw his consent to magistrate jurisdiction. 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(4); Dixon v. Ylst, 990 F.2d at 480.

To the extent that plaintiff requests the appointment of counsel on the same grounds, the court denied plaintiff's subsequent motion to appoint counsel by an order entered on June 4,

2014. ECF No. 52. Therefore, this earlier-filed request is moot in light of the subsequent court order denying the same. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to recall his consent to the magistrate judge (ECF No. 45) is denied. DATED: June 20, 2014 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE