

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ALEJANDRA SOLANO,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE  
DEPARTMENT et al.,  
Defendants.

2:15-cv-01690-JCM-NJK

**ORDER**

**I. DISCUSSION**

On September 3, 2015, Plaintiff Alejandra Solano, counseled, initiated this lawsuit by filing a prisoner civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1 at 2, 4). On September 18, 2015, Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint. (ECF No. 4). Plaintiff is the guardian *ad litem* for Gabriela Solano, Alejandra Solano, and Luis, Solano Jr. (*Id.* at 1-2). Plaintiff served Defendants. (See ECF No. 3, 6, 7). On October 21, 2015, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the amended complaint. (ECF No. 8).

The Court ordinarily screens a prisoner’s complaint prior to service. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). Both 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a) and the Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”), 42 U.S.C. § 1997e, mandate early judicial screening of prisoner complaints. *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 213-14 (2007) (district courts must screen a prisoner’s complaint “before any responsive pleading is filed”). When defendants file an answer or responsive pleading, such as a motion to dismiss, the need for screening is obviated. See, e.g., *Nordstrom v. Ryan*, 762 F.3d 903, 907 n.1 (9th Cir. 2014) (noting that the “purpose of § 1915A is to ensure that the targets of frivolous or malicious suits need not bear the expense of responding”); *O’Neal v. Price*, 531 F.3d 1146, 1153 (9th Cir. 2008) (explaining that the PLRA’s screening provision

1 was intended “to conserve judicial resources by authorizing district courts to dismiss  
2 nonmeritorious prisoner complaints at an early stage”).

3 In this case, a screening order is not necessary. Defendants have responded to  
4 Plaintiff’s amended complaint by filing a motion to dismiss (ECF No. 8). This case shall  
5 proceed on the normal litigation track guided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

6 **II. CONCLUSION**

7 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that the Court will not issue a screening  
8 order in this case.


9 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case shall proceed on the normal litigation track  
10 guided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

11

12 DATED: This 19th day of November, 2015.

13

14

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
NANCY J. KORPE  
United States Magistrate Judge

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28