

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

* * *

VACLAV ONDRISEK, et al.,

 Plaintiffs,

 v.

US IMMIGRATION SERVICES,

 Defendant.

Case No. 2:18-cv-00411-APG-CWH


ORDER

Presently before the court is plaintiffs’ first amended complaint (ECF No. 8), filed on July 18, 2018.

Plaintiffs commenced this action on a pro se basis. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), upon granting plaintiffs’ request to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the court screened plaintiffs’ complaint. (Screening Order (ECF No. 3).) Plaintiffs subsequently were appointed counsel through the court’s pro bono program. (Order (ECF No. 5); Order (ECF No. 6).) Pro bono counsel filed the amended complaint. (Am. Compl. (ECF No. 8).) Given that the concerns underlying the screening requirement of § 1915(e) are obviated by the fact plaintiffs are represented by counsel, the court finds it is not in the interests of judicial economy to screen the amended complaint. The court therefore will not enter a screening order on the amended complaint. This case shall proceed on the normal litigation track as governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: July 19, 2018



C.W. HOFFMAN, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE