

1 Civ. P. 11 tend to substantially reduce the incidence of claims that are frivolous or otherwise
2 patently noncognizable on their face. Pro se litigants are not attorneys and should not be
3 expected to know how to draft pleadings as if they were. Judicial screening of prisoner
4 complaints serves to prevent prisoner complaints which are truly difficult, if not impossible to
5 understand, from being served upon defendants. Screening of represented cases to decipher
6 the allegations and claims is usually unnecessary. See, e.g., *Nordstrom v. Ryan*, 762 F.3d
7 903, 907 n.1 (9th Cir. 2014) (noting that the “purpose of § 1915A is to ensure that the targets
8 of frivolous or malicious suits need not bear the expense of responding”); *O’Neal v. Price*, 531
9 F.3d 1146, 1153 (9th Cir. 2008) (explaining that the PLRA’s screening provision was intended
10 to “conserve judicial resources by authorizing district courts to dismiss nonmeritorious prisoner
11 complaints at an early stage”). As such, the Court will not screen the second amended
12 complaint (ECF No. 21) in this counseled prisoner case. This case shall proceed on the
13 normal litigation track as guided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

14 **II. CONCLUSION**

15 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that the Court will not issue a screening
16 order on the second amended complaint in this case.

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

19
20 DATED: This 6th day of March, 2017.

21
22 
23 _____
24 NANCY J. KOPPE
25 United States Magistrate Judge
26
27
28