

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALFRED LOMBARDELLI,

Plaintiff,

v.

K. HALSEY, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:08-CV-00658-AWI-DLB PC

ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW  
CAUSE WITHIN THIRTY DAYS WHY  
DEFENDANT **T. HEBRON** SHOULD NOT BE  
DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE  
INFORMATION SUFFICIENT TO EFFECT  
SERVICE

/ (Doc. 23)

Plaintiff Alfred Lombardelli (“Plaintiff”) is a California state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding on Plaintiff’s second amended complaint, filed March 10, 2009. Docs. 15, 18. On June 2, 2009, the Court issued an order directing the United States Marshal to initiate service of process on Defendant T. Hebron. Doc. 22. The Marshals Service was unable to locate Defendant T. Hebron, and returned the summons unexecuted on June 25, 2009. Doc. 23.

Pursuant to Rule 4(m),

If a defendant is not served within 120 days after the complaint is filed, the court - on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff - must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

In cases involving a plaintiff proceeding in forma pauperis, the Marshal, upon order of the Court, shall serve the summons and the complaint. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(2). “[A]n incarcerated pro

1 se plaintiff proceeding in forma pauperis is entitled to rely on the U.S. Marshal for service of the  
2 summons and complaint and ... should not be penalized by having his action dismissed for failure  
3 to effect service where the U.S. Marshal or the court clerk has failed to perform his duties.” *Walker*  
4 *v. Sumner*, 14 F.3d 1415, 1422 (9th Cir. 1994) (quoting *Puett v. Blandford*, 912 F.2d 270, 275 (9th  
5 Cir. 1990)), *abrogated in part on other grounds, Sandin v. Conner*, 515 U.S. 472 (1995). “So long  
6 as the prisoner has furnished the information necessary to identify the defendant, the marshal’s  
7 failure to effect service is ‘automatically good cause . . . .’” *Walker*, 14 F.3d at 1422 (quoting *Sellers*  
8 *v. United States*, 902 F.2d 598, 603 (7th Cir.1990)). However, where a pro se plaintiff fails to  
9 provide the Marshal with accurate and sufficient information to effect service of the summons and  
10 complaint, the Court’s sua sponte dismissal of the unserved defendants is appropriate. *Walker*, 14  
11 F.3d at 1421-22.

12 In this instance, the information provided by Plaintiff is insufficient, as the facility, Corcoran  
13 State Prison, indicated that T. Hebron is no longer employed at the facility. The CDC locator  
14 indicates that there are two individuals who are named T. Hebron. If Plaintiff is unable to provide  
15 the Marshal with further information so that Defendant T. Hebron can be located, the defendant shall  
16 be dismissed from the action, without prejudice. Pursuant to Rule 4(m), the Court will provide  
17 Plaintiff with the opportunity to show cause why Defendant T. Hebron should not be dismissed from  
18 the action at this time.

19 Accordingly, based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 20 1. Within **thirty (30) days** from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall show  
21 cause why Defendant T. Hebron should not be dismissed from this action; and
- 22 2. The failure to respond to this order or the failure to show cause will result in  
23 recommendation of dismissal of Defendant T. Hebron from this action.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 **Dated: February 1, 2011** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
**/s/ Dennis L. Beck**  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE