| 1 | |
|--------|---|
| 1 2 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 2 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 4 | |
| 5 | LUIS FERNANDO TORRES, et al., CASE NO. 1:10-cv-00670 LJO SKO |
| 6 | Plaintiffs, ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE |
| 7 | VS. |
| 8 | COUNTY OF MADERA, et al., |
| 9 | Defendants. |
| 10 | / |
| 11 | Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint (the operative complaint) on June 30, 2010. (Doc. 17.) |
| 12 | Therein, Jesus Hernandez and Nick Rojas, among others, are identified as defendants to this action. It |
| 13 | appears, however, that service of process was never effectuated on Jesus Hernandez or Nick Rojas. In |
| 14 | fact, in an order filed April 7, 2011, the magistrate judge assigned to this case noted this deficiency and |
| 15 | warned Plaintiffs that the defendants would be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure |
| 16 | 4(m) unless service of process was effectuated by April 18, 2011. (Doc. 38.) Despite this warning, it |
| 17 | appears that Plaintiffs have still not effectuated service on Jesus Hernandez or Nick Rojas. |
| 18 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that by November 17, 2011, Plaintiffs shall provide |
| 19 | the Court a status report regarding this service issue and show cause why Jesus Hernandez and Nick |
| 20 | Rojas should not be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). If either this order is |
| 21 | ignored or good cause is not sated, these two defendants will be dismissed sua sponte on November 18, |
| 22 | 2011. |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | IT IS SO ORDERED. |
| 26 | Dated: November 15, 2011 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| | |