Cox vs. Randazza, et al., Doc. 18

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

CRYSTAL COX,)
Plaintiff,))) 2:13-cv-00297-MMD-VCF
V.)
MARC J. RANDAZZA, et al,) MINUTE ORDER)
Defendants.)) Dated: May 6, 2013
PRESENT: THE HONORABLE CAM FEI	 -
JUDICIAL ASSISTANT: <u>Mai Tieu</u>	RECORDER: None
COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S):	None Appearing
COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S):	None Appearing
Defende continue de metter of C	

Before the court is the matter of *Cox v. Randazza*, et al. (Case No. 2:13-cv-00297-MMD-VCF).

Plaintiff filed her motion/application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (#1) and complaint (#1-1) on February 26, 2013. Plaintiff filed eleven motions between March 26, 2013, and April 12, 2013. (#7– #17). Upon granting a request to proceed *in forma pauperis*, a court must additionally screen a complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e). Federal courts are given the authority to dismiss a case if the action is legally "frivolous or malicious," fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). As the court has not issued an order on plaintiff's motion/application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (#1) and has not screened plaintiff's complaint (#1-1), plaintiff may re-file the motions *after* the court issues an order on the motion/application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (#1) and screens the complaint (#1-1).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's motions (#7, #8, #9, #10, #11, #12, #13, #14, #15, #16 and #17) are denied *without prejudice*. If appropriate, plaintiff may re-file the motions *after* the court issues an order on the motion/application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (#1) and screens the complaint (#1-1).

CAM FERENBACH

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE