

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

DION ANDERSON,)	1:12-cv-01966 LJO DLB PC
)	
Plaintiff,)	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION
)	RECOMMENDING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
vs.)	TO ENTER DEFAULT BE DENIED
)	
L. CAHLANDER, et al.,)	[ECF No. 25]
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff Dion Anderson (“Plaintiff”) is a California state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed this action on December 3, 2012.

On June 7, 2013, the Court dismissed the complaint and granted Plaintiff leave to file a First Amended Complaint. On August 23, 2013, Plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint. On July 10, 2014, he filed a motion for leave to file a Second Amended Complaint and lodged the proposed Second Amended Complaint. On August 25, 2014, the Court granted the motion to file a Second Amended Complaint. The Second Amended Complaint is currently pending screening by the Court.

On October 14, 2014, Plaintiff filed the instant motion for entry of default. Plaintiff contends that Defendants have neither filed an answer, extension of time, or entered the

1 appearance of an attorney within the time deadline. Plaintiff is advised that service of process
2 has not yet been effected on Defendants, triggering their obligation to respond to his complaint.
3 Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(e). In this case, the United States Marshal will be directed to initiate service of
4 process on Plaintiff's behalf when the Court has determined that Plaintiff's complaint states
5 cognizable claims for relief and service is appropriate. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d); Fed. R. Civ. P.
6 4(c)(2). The Court has not yet screened the Second Amended Complaint. Therefore, service is
7 not yet appropriate.
8

9 **RECOMMENDATION**

10 For all of the foregoing reasons, this Court recommends that Plaintiff's motion to enter
11 default against Defendants be DENIED.

12 These Findings and Recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge
13 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen
14 (14) days after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, the parties may file
15 written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate
16 Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The parties are advised that failure to file objections
17 within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v.
18 Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
19

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: October 17, 2014

22 /s/ Dennis L. Beck
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28