

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRYAN E. RANSOM,) 1:12cv01343 AWI DLB PC
)
) Plaintiff,) ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS
) AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND
) vs.) DISMISSING CERTAIN DEFENDANTS
) FOR FAILURE TO EFFECTUATE
) SERVICE OF PROCESS
)
) RODOLFO AGUIRRE, et al.,) (Document 59)
)
) Defendants.)

Plaintiff Bryan E. Ransom (“Plaintiff”) is a prisoner in the custody of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”). Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants Vogel, Perez, Marsical, Cortez, Vellejo, Singh, Aguirre, Wooden, Alanis, Messick, Ulit, Moon, Kernan, Clark and Wang removed the action on August 16, 2012.

On April 3, 2013, the Court ordered Plaintiff, who is not proceeding in forma pauperis, to serve Defendants Martines, Watkins, Hieng, Lovelady, Hubbard, Hugh, Weaver, Macias, Lopez and Gibson pursuant to Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff failed to serve these Defendants within one-hundred and twenty (120) days and the Court subsequently issued an order to show cause.

1 On November 21, 2013, after Plaintiff filed a response to the order to show cause, the
2 Court issued [Findings and Recommendations](#) that Defendants Martines, Watkins, Hieng,
3 Lovelady, Hubbard, Hugh, Weaver, Macias, Lopez and Gibson be dismissed from this action for
4 Plaintiff's failure to effectuate service of process. The Findings and Recommendations were
5 served on the parties and contained notice that any objections were to be filed within thirty (30)
6 days. No objections have been filed.

7
8 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted
9 a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds that the
10 Findings and Recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 12 1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed November 21, 2013, are ADOPTED in
13 full;
14 2. Defendants Martines, Watkins, Hieng, Lovelady, Hubbard, Hugh, Weaver,
15 Macias, Lopez and Gibson are DISMISSED from this action.

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: January 10, 2014



19 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE