UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.	CV 17-3808-IVI	WF (KS)	Date: June 25, 2018	
Title	Natalio Treviza	Natalio Trevizo v. S. Webster, et al.		
Present: 7	The Honorable:	Inited States Magistrate Judge		
	•			
	Roxanne Hora	n-Walker	N/A	
Deputy Clerk			Court Reporter / Recorder	
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:			Attorneys Present for Defendants:	

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: DISMISSAL

On August 8, 2017, Plaintiff, a California state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a Civil Rights Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 ("Complaint"). (Dkt. No. 1.) On October 12, 2017, the case was closed based on Plaintiff's failure to submit necessary documentation in support of his request to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Dkt. No. 6.) On February 14, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Reopen Case on the grounds that he had properly submitted the full filing fee. (Dkt. Nos. 8, 9.) On February 22, 2018 the Honorable Michael W. Fitzgerald granted the Motion to Reopen Case. (Dkt. No. 10.)

On March 6, 2018, the Court issued a Clarifying Order Re: Service of Complaint, requiring that Plaintiff serve the Complaint and Summons on each defendant within 90 days after the case was reopened. (Dkt. No. 13.) The Court also ordered that, no later than one week after the expiration of the 90-day period, "Plaintiff must file with the Court a separate proof of service for each defendant served within the 90-day period." (*Id.* at 1.) Plaintiff was expressly warned that "his failure to effect proper service by the expiration of the 90-day period may result in dismissal of the action without prejudice as to any unserved defendant(s) unless Plaintiff can show good cause for extending the time for service." (*Id.* at 1-2 (emphasis supplied in original).) Accordingly, Plaintiff was required to submit a proof of service for each defendant no later than May 30, 2018.

On April 10, 2018, Plaintiff submitted a Proof of Service to the Court, and, on April 16, 2018, the Court issued a Notice of Document Discrepancies, rejecting the Proof of Service because it was incomplete and did not contain a signature. (Dkt. No. 14.) On May 21, 2018, Plaintiff submitted another Proof of Service, which the Court subsequently rejected because it

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 17-586	68-MWF (KS)	Date: June 2	25, 2018	
Title <u>Natalio Tr</u>	evizo v. S. Webster, et al.			
party. (Dkt. No. 16.) filing a Proof of Service Pursuant to Ru to involuntary dismissionder." Accordingly,	At this point, almost four ce for each defendant, and let let 41(b) of the Federal Rulal if a plaintiff "fails to prothe Court could properly reference."	ents were served, and was submit weeks have passed since Plaintiff the has failed to do so correctly. The description of the comply with these recommend dismissal of the action court's March 6, 2018 Order.	's deadline for may be subject ules or a court	
or before July 25, 20 for failure to prosecu extension of time to signed under penalty the Court's March (Alternatively, Plainti	18, why the Court should ite. Plaintiff may dischard file a Proof of Service for of perjury that establish 5, 2018 Order or (2) a coff may dismiss the entire	aintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW not recommend that this action rge this Order by filing: (1) a re for each defendant along with nes good cause for his failure to rrected Proof of Service for each matter without prejudice by filit of the Federal Rules of Civil Pr	be dismissed request for an a declaration comply with the defendant. ng a Notice of	
Plaintiff is advised that the failure to timely comply with this order may result in the dismissal of this case pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) and Local Rule 41-1.				
IT IS SO ORI	DERED.			
		Initials of Preparer	: rhw	