27

28

¹ On June 16, 2011, Plaintiff requested information regarding proof of service of Defendant Phillips. (Doc. 26.) It appears Plaintiff has interpreted language in the Court's June 8, 2011 order as suggesting that service has been effectuated on Defendant Philips. (See Doc. 25 at 3.) The Court did not intend to suggest this, but rather, simply noted that service on Defendant Phillips had been authorized. Plaintiff's request for further information on proof of service will therefore be denied.