

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

KENNETH MILLS,	}	Case No. CV 16-04381-CBM (DTB)
Plaintiff,	}	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
vs.	}	
1ST WATCH TOWER OFFICER, et al.,	}	
Defendant(s).	}	

Plaintiff currently is incarcerated at California State Prison in Lancaster, California. On June 17, 2016, he filed a pro se civil rights action after being granted leave to proceed without the prepayment of full filing fee. The gravamen of plaintiff’s claims is that he was denied medical attention, in violation of his rights under the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution. (Complaint at 5.)

Plaintiff specifically alleges that his right to safely live in a cell without falling or hurting himself has been violated. (Id.) Plaintiff further alleges that he fell in his cell and banged on the door for medical assistance. (Id.)

The Complaint purported to be brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Named in the Complaint as defendants are “B2 Tower Officer 1st Watch Lancaster State Prison.” Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), 1915(A)(b), the Court screened the

1 Complaint and ordered service on the 1st Watch Tower Officer and the 1st Watch
2 Counting Officer in B2 Building in their individual capacity only. Plaintiff's Notice
3 of Submission of Documents to the United States Marshal was due on or before
4 August 14, 2016.

5 Plaintiff has failed to file his Notice of Submission of Documents within the
6 allotted time, nor has he requested an extension of time within which to do so.
7 Accordingly, on or before **September 23, 2016**, plaintiff is ORDERED to (a) show
8 good cause in writing, if any exists, why plaintiff has not filed his Notice of
9 Submission of Documents; or (b) show good cause in writing, if any exists, why
10 plaintiff has failed to serve the defendants within the requisite period of time, as the
11 failure to do so constitutes a basis to dismiss the action against such defendants
12 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). Plaintiff is forewarned that, if he fails to show
13 cause, or otherwise respond to this Court's Order, the Court will construe such
14 unresponsiveness as further evidence of plaintiff's lack of prosecution of this action,
15 and that such lack of prosecution will constitute a basis to dismiss this action in its
16 entirety.

17
18 DATED: August 31, 2016



19 DAVID T. BRISTOW
United States Magistrate Judge