1 2 3 4		
3		
4		
•		
_ 1		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	CARLOS VILLEGAS,	Case No. 1:10-cv-01917-AWI-SKO PC
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA
12	V.	(Doc. 31)
13	MATHEW CATE, et al.,	(Doc. 31)
14	Defendants.	
15		
16		
17	Plaintiff Carlos Villegas, a star	te prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed
18	this civil rights action pursuant to 4	2 U.S.C. § 1983 on October 14, 2010. This action is
19	proceeding on Plaintiff's amended	complaint against Defendant Neubarth for acting with
20	deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's serious medical needs, in violation of the Eighth Amendment	
21	of the United States Constitution.	
22	On August 12, 2013, Plaintiff f	lled a motion seeking the issuance of a subpoena for service
23	of process on Defendant Neubarth.	
24	The United States Marshal was	s directed to initiate service of the summons and amended
25	complaint on December 6, 2012, and t	he Marshal was provided with a subpoena at that time. At
26	this juncture, the Marshal is still attem	pting to execute service of process on Defendant Neubarth
27	at Coalinga State Hospital, where he is	currently employed. If further information is needed from
28	Plaintiff, he will be notified via order.	The Court and the Marshal have a duty to ensure process is

1	served on Plaintiff's behalf, and Plaintiff may be assured that the Court is aware service is still	
2	outstanding in this case. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3).	
3	Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff's motion for the issuance of a subpoena is HEREBY	
4	DENIED.	
5		
6		
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
8	Dated: August 16, 2013 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
9	UNITED STATES MADISTRATE JUDGE	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

¹ Because Plaintiff is not responsible for serving Defendant Neubarth himself, he does not need to be concerned about the 120-day time limit set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).