1	WO	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
8		
9	Vickie Ann Dean,	
10	Plaintiff, No. CIV 08-1418-PHX-JWS (DKD)	
11	vs.) ORDER	
12	DeLinda Haynes,	
13	Defendant.	
14	/	
15	Plaintiff filed this lawsuit on July 31, 2008 (Doc. #1); the amended complaint was filed	
16	November 10, 2008 (Doc. #6). A review of the file indicates these were the only pleadings filed	
17	by Plaintiff. Service upon Defendant Haynes has been unsuccessful. On August 17, 2009, the	
18	Attorney General's Office filed a notice stating that Defendant Haynes is not currently	
19	employed by the ADC and was not directly employed by the ADC at the times relevant to	
20	Plaintiff's Complaint. Furthermore, the ADC obtained the nursing services of Defendant	
21	through a nursing registry and they were advised by ADC staff that the registry was contacted	
22	to obtain a last known address for Defendant. The registry advised that Defendant Haynes was	
23	terminated on July 27, 2008, and the registry does not have a last known address (Doc. #13).	
24	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) states:	
25	(m) Time Limit for Service. If a defendant is not served within 120 days after	
26	the complaint is filed, the court — on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff — must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or	
27	order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an	
28	appropriate period. This subdivision (m) does not apply to service in a foreign country under Rule $4(f)$ or $4(j)(1)$.	

LRCiv 41.1, Rules of Practice of the United States District Court for the District of
 Arizona provides that "[c]ases which have had no proceedings for six (6) or more months may
 be dismissed by the Court for want of prosecution."

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff shall have twenty (20) days from the
date of the filing of this Order to show good cause why this case should not be dismissed
pursuant to LRCiv 41.1, Rules of Practice of the United States District Court for the District of
Arizona, for want of prosecution and Rule 4(m), F.R.Civ.P. If plaintiff fails to comply with this
Order, this action shall be dismissed.

DATED this 18th day of September, 2009.

David K. Duncan United States Magistrate Judge