

1 patently noncognizable on their face. Pro se litigants are not attorneys and should not be
2 expected to know how to draft pleadings as if they were. Judicial screening of prisoner
3 complaints serves to prevent prisoner complaints which are truly difficult, if not impossible to
4 understand, from being served upon defendants. Screening of represented cases to decipher
5 the allegations and claims is usually unnecessary. See, e.g., *Nordstrom v. Ryan*, 762 F.3d
6 903, 907 n.1 (9th Cir. 2014) (noting that the “purpose of § 1915A is to ensure that the targets
7 of frivolous or malicious suits need not bear the expense of responding”); *O’Neal v. Price*, 531
8 F.3d 1146, 1153 (9th Cir. 2008) (explaining that the PLRA’s screening provision was intended
9 to “conserve judicial resources by authorizing district courts to dismiss nonmeritorious prisoner
10 complaints at an early stage”). As such, the Court will not screen this counseled prisoner
11 case. This case shall proceed on the normal litigation track as guided by the Federal Rules
12 of Civil Procedure.

13 **II. CONCLUSION**

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

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

18

19 DATED: This 27th day of January, 2016.

20

21


United States Magistrate Judge

22

23

24

25

26

27

28