

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. CV 21-02228-VBF (DFM)

Date: January 18, 2023

Title Nigel M. Stimpson v. Unknown

Present: The Honorable	Douglas F. McCormick, United States Magistrate Judge	
Nancy Boehme		Court Reporter
Deputy Clerk		Not Present
Attorney(s) for Plaintiff(s):		Attorney(s) for Defendant(s):
Not Present		Not Present
Proceedings:	(IN CHAMBERS) Order to Show Cause	

In January 2022, the court issued an order authorizing Plaintiff to submit discovery requests to the Los Angeles County Counsel's office under Rule 31 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the purpose of determining the identities of Defendants. See Dkt. 18.¹ Pursuant to that order, Plaintiff submitted written questions to the office of the Los Angeles County Counsel in February 2022. See Dkt. 23 at 1.

In May 2022, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel under Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on the grounds that the Los Angeles County Counsel had failed to timely respond to Plaintiff's questions. See id. at 1-2. In June 2022, the Court granted Plaintiff's motion and ordered Los Angeles County Counsel to serve responses to Plaintiff's written questions within twenty-one days. See Dkt. 25.

In August 2022, the Court contacted Los Angeles County Counsel to confirm whether the office had complied with the Court's order. Los Angeles County Counsel, via its outside panel counsel, Collinson, Daehnke, Inlow & Greco, confirmed that Plaintiff's questions had been received and that a response to Plaintiff's questions would be sent via mail on September 1, 2022.

To date, Plaintiff has not filed anything with the Court in connection with its June 2022 order granting Plaintiff's motion to compel. It is incumbent upon Plaintiff to prosecute his case by providing the Court with the information necessary to effect service on Defendants. If Plaintiff

¹ More information was needed to identify Defendants and to complete service because the Second Amended Complaint only provided Defendants' first names; Defendants have common last names; and there was no record of any incident with Plaintiff on the date Plaintiff provided. See Dkts. 16-17.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

has not received a response from the Los Angeles County Counsel, he is expected to promptly advise the Court of this.

Plaintiff is thus ORDERED to show cause, in writing, **no later than twenty-one (21) days from the date of this order**, why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. Failure to respond to this order may result in a recommendation of dismissal of this action.