

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

RAY LEE VAUGHN, Sr.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
WEGMAN, et al.,  
Defendants.

**Case No. 1:15-cv-01902-LJO-JLT (PC)**  
**ORDER DIRECTING FURTHER STATEMENT  
FROM UNITED STATES MARSHALLS SERVICE ON  
SERVICE EFFORTS RE DEFENDANT BOWMAN**  
**14 DAY DEADLINE**

The Court found service of the First Amended Complaint to be appropriate on defendant Bowman. The summons for Bowman was recently returned unexecuted. Though the unexecuted summons indicated that the United States Marshal Service spoke to the litigation coordinator who stated that “Bowman resigned a ‘couple of years ago,’ and there is no contact information for him. They will not accept service.” (Doc. 19.) From this, it is unclear whether the USMS was provided a last known address or whether the last known address was sought. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3); *Walker v. Sumner*, 14 F.3d 1415 (9th Cir. 1994).

///  
///  
///  
///  
///

1           Accordingly, **within 14 days**, the Marshals Service is **DIRECTED** to file a statement or  
2 an amended Process Receipt and Return (Form USM-285) indicating whether it inquired into  
3 whether the CDCR had a last known address for Bowman regardless of whether the CDCR  
4 believes the address is current. If not, the Court **DIRECTS** the USMS to make this inquiry and  
5 to attempt service at the last known address.

6

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8           Dated: **July 10, 2017**

**/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston**  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28