36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent arguing factors and plaintiff does not consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent arguing factors." (Id. at 2.)			
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DANNY GEROME YOUNG, Plaintiff, V. ORDER Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	1		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DANNY GEROME YOUNG, Plaintiff, V. ORDER Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8) in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consant plaintiff any event." (Id. at 2.)	2		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DANNY GEROME YOUNG, Plaintiff, V. RODRIGUEZ, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consany [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	3		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DANNY GEROME YOUNG, Plaintiff, V. ORDER RODRIGUEZ, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not cons any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	4		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DANNY GEROME YOUNG, Plaintiff, V. ORDER Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	5		
B UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DANNY GEROME YOUNG, Plaintiff, v. ORDER Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consany [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	6		
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DANNY GEROME YOUNG, Plaintiff, V. ORDER Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consany [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	7		
DANNY GEROME YOUNG, Plaintiff, V. ORDER Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 17), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consany [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
DANNY GEROME YOUNG, Plaintiff, V. ORDER RODRIGUEZ, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
Plaintiff, v. ORDER RODRIGUEZ, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consany [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	10		
Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	11	DANNY GEROME YOUNG,	No. 2:15-cv-2604 KJM CKD P
RODRIGUEZ, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	12	Plaintiff,	
Defendants. Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	14	RODRIGUEZ, et al.,	
Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	15	Defendants.	
U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	16		
(ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No. 36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42	
36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No. 71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent arguing factors and plaintiff does not consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent arguing factors." (Id. at 2.)	18	U.S.C. § 1983. On January 14, 2016, plaintiff filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction	
71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	19	(ECF No. 8), while defendants declined magistrate judge jurisdiction on June 1, 2017 (ECF No.	
plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section 636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	20	36). On December 23, 2019, defendants filed a consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction (ECF No.	
636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent at [Sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	21	71), ostensibly resulting in the consent by all parties to magistrate judge jurisdiction. However,	
Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent at [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	22	plaintiff subsequently filed objections to defendants' consent, arguing that "28 U.S.C. Section	
believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent at this late stage at the la	23	636(c) does not authorize counsel for the defendants to embark on a ship that has sailed, and	
26 any [sic] any event." (<u>Id.</u> at 2.) 27	24	Plaintiff opposes this untimely motion." (ECF No. 72 at 1.) He further argues that he does not	
27	25	believe that defendants are entitled to consent at this late stage and that "Plaintiff does not consent	
	26	any [sic] any event." (Id. at 2.)	
Plaintiff's pretrial statement also states that he "would concede to a trial by the District Judge this matter." (ECF No. 73 at 2.)			

It appears that plaintiff is either attempting to claim that his consent lapsed² or moving to withdraw his consent. In either event, whether plaintiff's consent remains valid is a question for the District Judge. Branch v. Umphenour, 936 F.3d 994, 1003 (9th Cir. 2019) ("[O]nly a district judge may rule on a motion to withdraw consent to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge."). Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's objections to defendants' consent (ECF No. 72) are construed as a motion to find that plaintiff's consent has lapsed or to withdraw consent. Dated: January 10, 2020 CAROLYN K. DELANEY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 13:youn2604.consent

² In <u>Branch v. Umphenour</u>, plaintiff consented to magistrate judge jurisdiction, but defendants initially declined and did not consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction until over seven years after plaintiff had initially consented. 936 F.3d 994, 998, 1000 n.4 (9th Cir. 2019). The Ninth Circuit indicated the possibility that a party's consent could lapse if there is a significant passage of time between the party's initial consent and the consent of the other parties. Id. at 1000 n.4.