

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  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRIAN D. EDWARDS,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON LOS ANGELES COUNTY, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. CV 09-2584 GAF (AN)  
AMENDED ORDER TO SHOW  
CAUSE WHY ACTION SHOULD  
NOT BE DISMISSED

On April 22, 2009, Plaintiff, a *pro se* litigant proceeding *in forma pauperis*, commenced this action by filing his complaint. The Court's records reflect that none of the defendants have been served with the summons and complaint within 120 days of the date the complaint was filed, which was August 20, 2009, in violation of Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m). The Court's records further establish that Plaintiff never made a timely request for the marshal to serve the summons and complaint, and that he also failed to furnish information necessary to identify and serve each defendant. Accordingly, Plaintiff is hereby ordered to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for his failure to serve process within the time required by Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m). Within fifteen (15) days of the date of this Order, Plaintiff is directed to either file proofs of service showing that he

1 has effectuated service upon each of the defendants or file a declaration showing cause  
2 why the action should not be dismissed based upon his failure to serve the defendants  
3 within the time required by Fed.R.Civ.P. 4. Plaintiff is further warned that this action will  
4 be dismissed for want of prosecution and failure to comply with a Court order if he fails  
5 to file either proofs of service or a declaration by the Court-ordered deadline. *See*  
6 Fed.R.Civ.P. 41. No further notice will be given.

7  
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9  
10  
11 DATED: February 3, 2010

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ARTHUR NAKAZATO  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE