1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 BINH C. TRAN, No. 2:17-cv-1260 DB P 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. ORDER AND 14 K. YOUNG, et al., FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner is proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 18 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court is plaintiff's motion to stay this action pending his 19 transfer to another institution. 20 The United States Supreme Court has clearly indicated that "the power to stay 21 proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the 22 causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants. How this can best be done calls for the exercise of judgment, which must weigh competing 23 interests and maintain an even balance." Landis v. North American Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254-55 24 25 (1936). In this regard, "the proponent of the stay bears the burden of establishing its need." 26 Clinton v. Jones, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997). 27 Plaintiff has failed to show why a stay of these proceedings is necessary. Though plaintiff 28 expresses concern about missing court orders and motions that may result in the dismissal of this

action, the record reveals no such prejudice. No dispositive motions have yet been filed in this case, and this matter is still in the screening phase. In addition, plaintiff has long since been transferred to the new institution.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that a district judge be assigned to this case; and IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that plaintiff's motion for stay (ECF No. 9) be denied.

These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any response to the objections shall be filed and served within seven days after service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may result in waiver of the right to appeal the district court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991).

Dated: January 25, 2018

i Well

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

/DLB7;

DB/Inbox/Substantive/tran1260.stay.fr