

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Prince Paul Raymond Williams v. Professional Courier and
Newspaper Distribution, d/b/a Brandt Brothers, et al.**

Williams v. Professional Courier · No. 1:25-cv-00973-KES-HBK · Decided January 12, 2026

OPINION

Prince Paul Raymond Williams v. Professional Courier and Newspaper Distribution, d/b/a Brandt Brothers, et al.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 PRINCE PAUL RAYMOND WILLIAMS, Case No. 1:25-cv-00973-KES-HBK 12 Plaintiff,
ORDER DENYING PRO SE PLAINTIFF'S

MOTION FOR ELECTRONIC FILING

13 v. PERMISSION WITHOUT PREJUDICE

14 PROFESSIONAL COURIER AND (Doc. 4)

NEWSPAPER DISTRIBUTION, d/b/a

15 Brandt Brothers, et al., 16 Defendants. 17 18 19 Pending before the Court is pro se Plaintiff's motion seeking permission to utilize the 20 Court's case management and electronic filing system (CM/ECF) filed on August 13, 2025. 21 (Doc. 4). Plaintiff argues "[d]enial of filing mechanisms impedes the fundamental right of 22 access." (Id. at 1). Plaintiff lists the following reasons in support of his motion: (1) as an 23 indigent litigant he cannot afford the printing and copying costs; (2) electronic filing will ensure 24 he is able to timely respond to pleadings and not miss deadlines; and (3) electronic filing will 25 "safeguard" his constitutional rights. (Id. at 2-3). 26 The Court utilizes CM/ECF, which requires attorneys to adhere to electronic procedures 27 set forth in the Court's Local Rules to file documents electronically. L.R. 133(a) (E.D. Cal. 28 2025). The Local Rules specifically prohibit pro se parties from utilizing electronic filing except 1 with the permission of the assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge. L.R. 133(b)(2); L.R. 183(c). Any 2 request from a pro se party to utilize electronic filing "shall be submitted as stipulations as 3 provided in L.R. 143." L.R. 133(b)(3). If the moving party cannot obtain a stipulation, the 4 request must include "an explanation of the reasons for the exception." Id. 5 The Court acknowledges that Plaintiff cannot obtain a stipulation since no defendant has 6 been served in this action. Having reviewed Plaintiff's stated reasons, the Court finds Plaintiff 7 has not stated a sufficient explanation as to why he should be exempted from the Court's Local 8 Rules. Plaintiff's

argument that access to CM/ECF would be more convenient and cost-effective 9 is insufficient to warrant granting Plaintiff e-filing access. See *Lucero v. Pennella*, Case No. 10 1:18-cv-01448-LJO-SAB, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 188219, 2018 WL 5793429, *2 (E.D. Cal.

11 Nov. 2, 2018) (denying motion for reconsideration on an order denying CM/ECF access where 12 pro se plaintiff argued conventional filing was too costly and inconvenient). Plaintiff's 13 proposition that he will be denied access to the court if not granted e-filing privileges is without 14 substance. A review of the docket reflects the Court has received multiple filings from Plaintiff 15 and Plaintiff has not missed a court-ordered deadline. Indeed, the Court affords additional time 16 when setting case management deadlines in cases with pro se litigants and it generously grants 17 extensions of time to pro se litigants when requested. Consequently, there is no evidence to 18 suggest Plaintiff is disadvantaged in his ability to litigate this case because he does not have 19 access to CM/ECF. 20 Further, this case is in the early procedural stages. The Court recently found the first 21 amended complaint failed to state a cognizable claim and directed Plaintiff to file a second 22 amended complaint. Thus, while the Court is sensitive to the challenges Plaintiff faces as a pro se 23 litigant, Plaintiff has failed to present sufficient grounds justifying an exemption from 24 conventional filing at this time to deviate from the Local Rule that "[a]ny person appearing pro se 25 may not utilize electronic filing." L.R. 133(b)(2). Should this case progress and the 26 circumstances change, Plaintiff may renew his motion at a future time. 27 //// 28 //// 1 Accordingly, it is ORDERED: 2 Plaintiff's motion for access to the Court's electronic case filing system (Doc. 4) is 3 | DENIED without prejudice. 4 ° Dated: _ January 12, 2026 Mibu □ Zh fare Hack

6 HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA

4 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28