

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

THORNELL BROWN,

CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00573-DLB PC

Plaintiff,

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

v.

FAMBROUGH, et al.,

Defendants.

(Doc. 15)

Plaintiff Thornell Brown (“Plaintiff”) is a 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 complaint, filed March 30, 2009. (Doc. 1.) On November 13, 2009, the Court issued an order directing the United States Marshal to initiate service of process on ten defendants. (Doc. 13.) The Marshal was unable to locate and serve Defendant C. Hay and on February 1, 2010, the Marshal returned the USM-285 form to the Court. (Doc. 15.)

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 on other grounds by Sandin v. Connor, 515 U.S. 472 (1995). “So long as the
6 prisoner has furnished the information necessary to identify the defendant, the marshal’s failure to
7 effect service is ‘automatically good cause’” Walker, 14 F.3d at 1422 (quoting Sellers v. United
8 States, 902 F.2d 598, 603 (7th Cir.1990)). However, where a pro se plaintiff fails to provide the
9 Marshal with accurate and sufficient information to effect service of the summons and complaint,
10 the Court’s sua sponte dismissal of the unserved defendants is appropriate. Walker, 14 F.3d at 1421-
11 22.

12 In this instance, the address provided by Plaintiff for Defendant C. Hay is no longer accurate,
13 as Defendant C. Hay is no longer employed at the facility, Kern Valley State Prison. (Doc. 15.)
14 There are also too many C. Hays in the CDCR database. If Plaintiff is unable to provide the Marshal
15 with a current address at which Defendant C. Hay can be located, the defendant shall be dismissed
16 from the action, without prejudice. Pursuant to Rule 4(m), the Court will provide Plaintiff with the
17 opportunity to show cause why Defendant C. Hay should not be dismissed from the action at this
18 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 C. Hay 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 dismissal of Defendant C. Hay from this action.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 **Dated: April 3, 2010**

/s/ Dennis L. Beck
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

26
27
28