UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 JEREMIAH VALENZUELA,

D1 : .:.cc

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:15-cv-00291-SAB

ORDER DISCHARGING ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

(ECF Nos. 8, 9)

TWENTY-DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff filed the complaint in this action challenging the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying benefits on February 23, 2015, along with an application to proceed in forma pauperis. Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis was approved on February 26, 2015, and a summons and scheduling order were issued in this action on that same date. The scheduling order informed Plaintiff that "Except when other provision is made pursuant to an application to proceed in forma pauperis, within twenty (20) days of filing the complaint, appellant shall serve the summons, complaint, the notice and form of consent to proceed before a magistrate judge provided by Local Rule 305(a), and a copy of this order and file return of service with this court." (Scheduling Order ¶ 1, ECF No. 6.)

On April 8, 2015, after Plaintiff did not file a proof of service in compliance with the scheduling order, the Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file a notice of status of service

within ten days. (ECF No. 7.) Plaintiff did not respond to the April 8, 2015 order.

On April 23, 2015, an order issued requiring Plaintiff to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the orders of the Court. On April 30, 2015, Plaintiff filed a response stating that counsel was unable to open the summons, ECF No. 5, and had made several calls to the clerk's help desk to obtain assistance with the issue and eventually received an e-mail from Lori Wagers.

Counsel is advised that in practicing in the Eastern District counsel are expected to become familiar with the Local Rules and comply with the orders issued by the Court. The Court finds Plaintiff's response to the order to show cause to be without merit. The summons in this action issued on February 26, 2015. When Plaintiff encountered problems with opening the document several attempts were made to contact the help desk and after receiving an e-mail on April 16, 2015, to which they responded no reply has been received. However, based upon the information Plaintiff is providing, counsel is contacting the Central District for assistance in this action. Further the Court issued an order on April 8, 2015, and Plaintiff has provided no reason why he did not comply with the order.

While the Court is sympathetic to the issue that counsel experienced in attempting to view the document, the lack of diligence in addressing the problem is not taken lightly by this Court. Counsel needs to verify that it is the Eastern District instructions that are being used to access the Eastern District ECM/ECF system. The Court has checked with the Clerk's Office and they are aware of no other attorney that has experienced a similar problem which indicates that this may be a problem for counsel's IT department to resolve.

Counsel is directed to contact the Eastern District help desk at (866) 884-5525 if further assistance is needed. If Plaintiff continues to be unable to access the summons, he should contact the Eastern District Clerk's Office and request a copy of the document so service can be completed in compliance with the Court's scheduling order.

Based on Plaintiff's response, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the order to show cause, filed April 23, 2015 is DISCHARGED. Plaintiff is ordered to file the return of service within twenty days from the date of service of this order. Failure to comply with this order will result in

sanctions up to and including dismissal of this action. IT IS SO ORDERED. Lug A. Be Dated: May 1, 2015 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE