Moore v. Fox et al

Doc. 4

The complaint appears to state a cognizable claim for relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b). If the allegations are proven, plaintiff has a reasonable opportunity to prevail on the merits of this action. The court, therefore, finds that service is appropriate and will direct service by the U.S. Marshal without pre-payment of costs. Plaintiff is informed, however, that this action cannot proceed further until plaintiff complies with this order. Plaintiff is warned that failure to comply with this order may result in dismissal of the action. See Local Rule 110.

Pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rules, this case was not assigned to a District Judge when the case was filed. The parties have not consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction and the court now finds that assignment of a District Judge is necessary to properly address the case.

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The Clerk of the Court is directed to randomly assign a District Judge and to update the docket to reflect the new case number;
- 2. The Clerk of the Court shall re-designate this matter as a counseled civil action;
  - 3. The court authorizes service on the following defendant(s):

FOX;
THUMSER;
ELAM;
BICK;
CAROLAN;
HORGAN;

TEUCCI; and

ZAMORA;

TOCH;

4. The Clerk of the Court shall issue a summons in a civil case, the assigned District Judge's new case documents, and as appropriate to the procedures of the assigned District Judge, an order setting this matter for an initial scheduling conference.

DATED: August 7, 2018

CRAIG M. KELLISON

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE