1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 ALVARA QUEZADA, Case No. 1:09-cv-01856-LJO-BAM (PC) 11 Plaintiff, ORDER NOTIFYING PARTIES THAT NINETY-DAY PERIOD WITHIN WHICH 12 TO FILE MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION v. HAS NOT BEEN TRIGGERED BY FILING 13 FISHER, et al., OF NOTICE DUE TO SERVICE DEFICIENCY 14 Defendants. (Doc. 65) 15 16 Plaintiff Alvaro Quezada ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma 17 pauperis in this civil action. On July 30, 2015, Defendant C. Scott's attorney filed a notice of 18 Scott's death on the record. (Doc. 65.) 19 Rule 25(a)(1) provides for the dismissal of Defendant Scott from this action if a motion for 20 substitution is not made within ninety days after service of a statement noting Scott's death. Fed. 21 R. Civ. P. 25(a)(1). Two things are required of a party for the running of the ninety-day period to 22 commence: a party must 1) formally suggest the death of the party on the record, and 2) serve the 23 suggestion of death on the other parties and the nonparty successors or representatives of the 24 deceased. Barlow v. Ground, 39 F.3d 231, 233 (9th Cir. 1994). In order for the ninety-day period 25 for substitution to be triggered, a party must formally suggest the death of the party upon the 26

record, Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(a)(1), and must serve other parties and nonparty successors or

representatives of the deceased with a suggestion of death in the same manner as required for

27

28

service of the motion to substitute, Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(a)(3). Thus, a party may be served with the suggestion of death by service on his or her attorney, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b), while non-party successors or representatives of the deceased party must be served the suggestion of death in the manner provided by Rule 4 for the service of a summons. Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(a)(3); Barlow, 39 F.3d at 232-234. Rule 25 requires dismissal absent a motion for substitution within the ninety-day period only if the statement of death was properly served. Unicorn Tales, Inc., v. Bannerjee, 138 F.3d 467, 469-471 (2d Cir. 1998). The parties are HEREBY NOTIFIED that the ninety-day period has not been triggered by the notice because there is no declaration of service or other proof reflecting that there was proper service of the notice on Defendant Scott's successor or representative as provided by Rule 4. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/Barbara A. McAuliffe Dated: August 3, 2015 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE