

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.: CV 22-07520-AB (JEMx)

Date: January 17, 2023

Title: Courtney Costello et al v. City of Los Angeles et al

Present: The Honorable **ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR., United States District Judge**

Carla Badirian  
Deputy Clerk

N/A  
Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):

None Appearing

None Appearing

**Proceedings: [In Chambers] Order To Show Cause Re: Dismissal for Lack of Prosecution**

Plaintiff(s) are **ORDERED** to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. *Link v. Wabash R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626 (1962) (Court has inherent power to dismiss for lack of prosecution on its own motion).

The below time period(s) has not been met. Accordingly, the Court, on its own motion, orders Plaintiff(s) to show cause, in writing, **on or before January 31, 2023**, why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. This matter will stand submitted upon the filing of Plaintiff(s) response. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78*. Failure to respond will be deemed consent to the dismissal of the action.

Absent a showing of good cause, an action must be dismissed without prejudice if the summons and complaint are not served on a Defendant within 90 days after the complaint is filed. Plaintiff(s) have failed to file a proof of service within 90 days of the filing of the Complaint on the Defendant(s).

Plaintiff(s) can satisfy this order by showing that service was effectuated within the 90 day deadline or by showing good cause for the failure to do so. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**