

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
8

9 JASON ALAN,) Case No. CV 17-1898 FMO (FFMx)
10 Plaintiff,)
11 v.) **ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**
12 SECURITY CREDIT SERVICES, LLC, et)
al.,)
13 Defendants.)
14 _____)

15 Plaintiff filed his state-court complaint on February 10, 2017, (see Dkt. 1, Notice of Removal
16 (“NOR”) at ¶ 2; Dkt 1-1, Complaint), which was removed by certain defendants on March 9, 2017.
17 (See NOR). By order dated April 19, 2017, plaintiff was ordered to show cause, on or before April
18 25, 2017, why remaining defendant Opt Out Services LLC should not be dismissed for lack of
19 prosecution for failure to complete service of the summons and complaint as required by Rule
20 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.¹ (See Dkt. 20, Court’s Order of April 19, 2017).
21 Plaintiff was advised that the court may dismiss the action prior to the 90 days required by Rule
22 4(m) if plaintiff has not diligently prosecuted the action. (See id.). Moreover, plaintiff was
23 admonished that “[f]ailure to file a timely response to this Order to Show Cause may result in Opt
24 Out Services LLC being dismissed for lack of prosecution and for failure to comply with the orders
25 of the court, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-30,

26
27 _____
28 ¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all “Rule” references are to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

1 82 S.Ct. 1386, 1388 (1962).” (Id.). As of the date of this Order, plaintiff has not filed a response
2 to the OSC.² (See, generally, Dkt.).

3 Absent a showing of good cause, an action must be dismissed without prejudice if the
4 summons and complaint are not served on a defendant within 90 days after the complaint is filed.
5 Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). The court will grant plaintiff one final opportunity to comply with Rule 4(m).

6 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

7 1. Plaintiff shall file a proof of service no later than **May 12, 2017**.

8 2. Plaintiff is again admonished that failure to respond to the OSC or file a proof of service
9 by the May 12, 2017, deadline will result in the action being dismissed without prejudice for lack
10 of prosecution and/or failure to comply with the orders of the court. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Link
11 v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-30, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 1388 (1962).

12 3. The Order to Show Cause Re: Dismissal Re: Lack of Prosecution, is hereby continued
13 pending compliance with paragraph one above.

14 Dated this 3rd day of May, 2017.

15
16 /s/

17 _____
18 Fernando M. Olguin
19 United States District Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 _____
28 ² Plaintiff has dismissed the two other defendant named in the Complaint. (See Dkt. 17 & 19).