

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

JEREMY JONES,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ARNETTE, et al.,

Defendants.

**1:16-cv-01212-DAD-GSA-PC**

**ORDER FOR PLAINTIFF TO PROVIDE  
INFORMATION SUFFICIENT TO IDENTIFY  
DEFENDANTS VASQUEZ AND LOPEZ AND  
TO IDENTIFY THEIR LOCATION(S) FOR  
SERVICE OF PROCESS**

**FORTY-FIVE-DAY DEADLINE**

Jeremy Jones (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. § 12132. This case now proceeds with Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint, filed on September 10, 2018, on (1) Plaintiff’s ADA claims against defendants Vasquez, Keener, Gonzales,<sup>1</sup> Flores, Arnett,<sup>2</sup> Zamora, and Lopez, in their official capacities; 2) Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment conditions of confinement claims against defendants Vasquez, Keener, and Gonzales; and (3) Plaintiff’s due process claims against defendants Vasquez, Keener, and Gonzales. (ECF No. 33.)

<sup>1</sup> Sued as Gonzalez.

<sup>2</sup> Sued as Arnette.

1 On February 8, 2021, the U.S. Marshal returned summonses to the court unexecuted for  
2 defendants Lopez and Vasquez with notations that there was not enough information to identify  
3 them for service of process. (ECF No. 69.) On March 24, 2021, the court issued an order  
4 requiring Plaintiff to show cause why defendants Lopez and Vasquez should not be dismissed  
5 from this action based on Plaintiff's failure to effect service on the two defendants. (ECF No.  
6 72.) After being granted an extension of time Plaintiff filed a response to the order to show cause  
7 on June 23, 2021. (ECF No. 91.)

8 Plaintiff argues that defendants Lopez and Vasquez should not be dismissed for failure to  
9 serve them because he has not exhausted his efforts to identify them. Plaintiff reports that he  
10 made a discovery request for defendants to produce service information, and he plans to request  
11 information from CDCR through the litigation coordinator. Plaintiff states that the Attorney  
12 General has acknowledged that she will represent defendants Lopez and Vasquez upon service,  
13 and Plaintiff has served discovery requests on the Attorney General's office for these defendants.

14 Plaintiff shall be required to provide sufficient information to the court within 45 days to  
15 identify and locate defendants Lopez and Vasquez for service of process of the date of service of  
16 this order,

17 Accordingly, based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 18 1. Within 45 days of the date of service of this order, Plaintiff is required to provide  
19 the court with sufficient information to identify and locate defendants Lopez and  
20 Vasquez for service of process; and
- 21 2. Plaintiff's failure to comply with this order shall result in a recommendation that  
22 defendants Lopez and Vasquez be dismissed from this case.

23  
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: July 17, 2021

/s/ Gary S. Austin  
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE