1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 JANE DOE, No. 2:24-cv-1542 DJC AC P 12 Plaintiff, 13 **ORDER** v. 14 MARCUS JOHNSON, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding through counsel with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The parties have filed a stipulation for an extension of time for defendants 18 19 Macomber, Hickethier, Gonzalez, Parker, Kent, and Montes to respond to the first amended 20 complaint and to file any objections or a stipulation to the motion to proceed under a pseudonym. 21 ECF No. 17. 22 The request will be granted as to the time to file objections to the motion to proceed under 23 a pseudonym. However, the court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against "a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity," 28 U.S.C. 24 25 § 1915A(a), regardless of whether plaintiff is represented by counsel, <u>In re Prison Litig. Reform</u> 26 Act, 105 F.3d 1131, 1134 (6th Cir. 1997) ("District courts are required to screen all civil cases 27 brought by prisoners, regardless of whether the inmate paid the full filing fee, is a pauper, is pro 28 se, or is represented by counsel, as [§ 1915A] does not differentiate between civil actions brought 1

by prisoners."). Therefore, because the complaint has yet to be screened, the stipulated request for an extension of time to file a response to the complaint will be denied and a deadline for filing a response will be set once the complaint is screened. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The parties' stipulation is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part; plaintiff's motion to proceed under a pseudonym is GRANTED; and DENIED as unnecessary. DATED: August 29, 2024

2. The request that defendants have until September 27, 2024, to file any objections to 3. The request for an extension of time for defendants to respond to the complaint is Muson Clane UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE