

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 LAMONT SHEPARD,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 DR. COHEN,

12 Defendant.
13
14

1:11-cv-00535-DAD-EPG (PC)

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
THE (2) ADDRESSES OF ERIC COHEN,
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
EFFECTIVE SERVICE AND PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO PROCEED
(ECF NOS. 119 & 122)

30-DAY DEADLINE

15 Lamont Shepard ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma*
16 *pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On October 21, 2016, Plaintiff
17 filed a change of address and motion for the (2) addresses of Eric Cohen, extension of time to
18 file effective service ("Motion 1"). (ECF No. 119). On October 26, 2016, Plaintiff filed a
19 motion to proceed ("Motion 2"). (ECF No. 122)

20 According to Motion 1, on August 2, 2016, Plaintiff was given defendant Dr. Cohen's Los
21 Angeles and New York addresses. On that same day Plaintiff filed a motion with the Court to
22 effect service on one or both addresses of defendant Dr. Cohen. However, on September 5,
23 2016, Plaintiff was placed in Administrative Segregation, and was separated from his property.
24 On October 10, 2016, Plaintiff received the order authorizing service on defendant Dr. Cohen
25 (ECF No. 118), but was unable to respond because he did not have his property. On October
26 13, 2016, Plaintiff was transferred to California State Prison, Calipatria. Plaintiff looked
27 through his legal mail, but was unable to locate the addresses for defendant Dr. Cohen.
28 Accordingly, Plaintiff requested additional time so that he could find the addresses or get them

1 again. Plaintiff also requested that “Defendants” resubmit defendant Dr. Cohen’s addresses to
2 him.

3 According to Motion 2, Plaintiff found defendant Dr. Cohen’s address. Plaintiff stated
4 that service may proceed.

5 Motion 1 will be denied as moot, because Plaintiff has apparently found defendant
6 Cohen’s address, and has submitted the service documents (ECF No. 120). Motion 2 will be
7 denied because a plaintiff proceeding *in forma pauperis* does not need to file a motion for
8 service to proceed after submitting the service documents.

9 Accordingly, it is ORDERED that Motion 1 and Motion 2 are denied.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.
11

12 Dated: October 31, 2016

13 /s/ Eric P. Groj
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28