

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

<b>Case No.</b>	CV 18-5607-JGB (GJS)	<b>Date</b>	October 15, 2018
<b>Title</b>	Arogant Hollywood v. City of South Pasadena, et al.		

**Present:** Hon. Gail J. Standish, United States Magistrate Judge

E. Carson

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

None present

None present

**Proceedings:** (IN CHAMBERS) Order To Show Cause Re: Possible Dismissal Under Rule 4(m)

On June 25, 2018, Plaintiff filed his Complaint in this action [Dkt. 1]. On July 3, 2018, the Court issued its Initial Order In Civil Rights Case [Dkt. 8, "Initial Order"]. Among other things, the Initial Order cautioned Plaintiff as follows:

Plaintiff must serve the summons and complaint on all named Defendants in this action within 90 days from the filing date of the Complaint, that is, by September 23, 2018. Plaintiff must file proof of service within 15 days of the date of service. If service is not completed within 90 days from the filing of the Complaint, the Court may dismiss this action in whole or against unserved defendants. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). Service of the summons and Complaint must comply with Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

(Initial Order at 4.)

As of September 23, 2018, no proof of service had been filed, no Defendant had appeared in this action, and no evidence existed that Plaintiff had made any effort to serve any of the Defendants with process. In fact, the docket shows that Plaintiff did not

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	CV 18-5607-JGB (GJS)	Date	October 15, 2018
Title	Arogant Hollywood v. City of South Pasadena, et al.		

obtain the Summons – the critical item for effective service of process, until September 24, 2018, *after* the Rule(m) period had expired.

The record demonstrates that Plaintiff did not serve any Defendant, or attempt to do so, within the Rule 4(m) period. Thus, it appears that dismissal of this action pursuant to Rule 4(m) may be warranted. Accordingly, Plaintiff is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why this action should not be dismissed due to his failure to effect service of process within the Rule 4(m) deadline. If Plaintiff wishes this action to proceed, then **by no later than October 31, 2018**, he shall file a response to this Order, in which he must: request an extension of the Rule 4(m) period; explain why he has not timely effected service of process; and set forth good cause for his noncompliance with Rule 4(m) and this Court’s Initial Order. Absent a timely response establishing good cause, this action may be dismissed under Rule 4(m).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**