1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	<b>UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT</b>		
9	EASTERN DIST	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10			
11	FRANK E. SISNEROZ,	1:05-cv-00519-AWI-GSA-PC	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER EXCUSING DEFENDANT TULARE COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	
13	V.	FROM RESPONDING TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO THE	
14	WHITMAN, et al.,	COURT'S ORDER OF OCTOBER 20, 2011 (Doc. 70.)	
15	Defendants.		
16			
17	Frank E. Sisneroz ("Plaintiff") is a civil detainee proceeding pro se in this civil rights		
18	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action now proceeds on the Second Amended		
19	Complaint filed on May 12, 2008 and the Supplemental Complaint filed on June 1, 2009, against		
20	defendants Bill Whitman, the County of Tula	are, Thomas F. Johnson, and Tulare County Mental	
21	Health Services. (Docs. 34, 47.) On October	r 17, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion to dismiss	
22	defendant Johnson from this action. (Doc. 68.)		
23	On October 20, 2011, the Court entered an order requiring defendant Tulare County		
24	Mental Health Services ("TCMHS") to respond to Plaintiff's motion to dismiss within thirty days		
25	(Doc. 70.) In requiring TCMHS to respond, the Court relied on Rule 41's requirement for a		

26 stipulation of dismissal before defendant Johnson could be dismissed from this action. Fed. R.

27 Civ. P. 41. The Court now finds that Plaintiff's motion to dismiss is more properly based on

28 failure to serve process under Rule 4, for which a stipulation is not required. Therefore, IT IS

///

responding to Plaintiff's motion to dismiss pursuant to the Court's order of October 20, 2011		
IT IS SO ORDERED.		
Dated:	November 15, 2011	/s/ Gary S. Austin UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE