| 1  |                                 |                                 |
|----|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2  |                                 |                                 |
| 3  |                                 |                                 |
| 4  |                                 |                                 |
| 5  |                                 |                                 |
| 6  |                                 |                                 |
| 7  |                                 |                                 |
| 8  | 711 wita Atatan                 | District (Count                 |
| 9  |                                 | District Court                  |
| 10 | Central Deistri                 | ct of California                |
| 11 |                                 |                                 |
| 12 | URBAN TEXTILE, INC.,            | Case No. 2:16-CV-09155-ODW(FFM) |
| 13 | Plaintiff,                      |                                 |
| 14 | V.                              | ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE             |
| 15 | MARK-EDWARDS APPAREL, INC.;     |                                 |
| 16 | STAGE STORES, INC.; SPECIALTY   |                                 |
| 17 | RETAILERS, INC.; and DOES 1–10, |                                 |
| 18 | inclusive                       |                                 |
| 19 | Defendants.                     |                                 |

20 /// 21 ///

On December 9, 2016, Plaintiff Urban Textile Inc. filed this lawsuit for copyright infringement. (ECF No. 1.) However, it appears Plaintiff failed to serve Defendants within the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) period.

Therefore, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to **SHOW CAUSE**, no later than **April 5, 2017**, why the Court should not dismiss this case for failure to effect service of process within the Rule 4(m) period. The Court will discharge this Order upon the filing of a proof of service as to each Defendant. Failure to timely respond to this

| 1        | Orden men hein des diensiesel of deie sone mideest annie dies mideest fordere                            |
|----------|--|
| 1<br>2   | Order may result in the dismissal of this case without prejudice without further warning from the Court. |
| 3        | warning from the court.  |
| 4        | IT IS SO ORDERED.  |
| 5        | March 28, 2017   |
| 6        | a:   |
| 7        | Whet or Wight  |
| 8        | OTIS D. WRIGHT, II<br>UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE   |
| 9        | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE   |
| 10       |  |
| 11       |  |
| 12       |  |
| 13       |  |
| 14       |  |
| 15       |  |
| 16       |  |
| 17       |  |
| 18       |  |
| 19<br>20 |  |
| 20<br>21 |  |
| 22       |  |
| 23       |  |
| 24       |  |
| 25       |  |
| 26       |  |
| 27       |  |
| 28       |  |
|          |  |
|          |  |