

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 W. MILLS,	}	Case No. CV 16-04607-CBM (DTB)
	}	
Plaintiff,	}	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
	}	
vs.	}	
	}	
MEDICAL DEPT "B" FACILITY	}	
LANCASTER STATE PRISON,	}	
	}	
Defendant(s).	}	

Plaintiff currently is incarcerated at California State Prison in Lancaster, California. On June 24, 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 was 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 he was placed in a cell without any power to run his fan or television. (Id.) Due to the lack of power, he was forced to "sweat" it out in his hot cell while it was over 90 degrees outside. (Id.) Plaintiff also alleges that he is forced to walk, without a walker, to obtain his prison medication. (Id.)

The Complaint purported to be brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Named in the Complaint as defendants are "Medical Dept 'B' Facility Lancaster State

1 Prison.” Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), 1915(A)(b), the Court screened the
2 Complaint and ordered service on Supervisor Ackdon in his individual capacity only.
3 Plaintiff’s Notice of Submission of Documents to the United States Marshal was due
4 on or before 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
20 United States Magistrate Judge
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28