1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		ES DISTRICT COURT TRICT OF CALIFORNIA Case No. 1:16-cv-00956-LJO-MJS ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO SERVE DEFENDANT ORDER VACATING APRIL 21, 2017 MANDATORY SCHEDULING CONFERENCE FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 	Plaintiff Jorge Negrete initiated this action on July 5, 2016 against Defendant Linda Lee Curkan. (ECF No. 1.) A summons issued the same day. (ECF No. 2.) An initial scheduling conference was set. (ECF No. 3.) The scheduling conference was continued several times due to Plaintiffs' apparent failure to serve Defendants. (ECF Nos. 4, 5, 6.) Plaintiff was reminded of the obligation to serve Defendant in compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). (<u>Id.</u>) To date, the docket reflects no efforts to serve Defendant. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) provides, in pertinent part: "If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the courton motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiffmust dismiss the action without prejudice against that	

defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows
 good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate
 period."

Here, service of the complaint is more than 180 days overdue. Accordingly, it is
HEREBY ORDERED that, within **fourteen days** of the date of this order, Plaintiff shall
either serve Defendant or show cause why this action should not be dismissed without
prejudice for failure to serve Defendant in compliance with Rule 4(m). In light of the
status of this case, the mandatory scheduling conference is HEREBY VACATED and will
be reset, if necessary, following Plaintiff's response to this order.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>April 5, 2017</u>

Ist Michael V. Seng

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE