

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**

|                             |   |                                 |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| PRISCILLA CAREFOOT, et al., | ) | Case No.: 1:17-cv-00456 AWI JLT |
|                             | ) |                                 |
| Plaintiffs,                 | ) | ORDER DISCHARGING ORDER TO SHOW |
|                             | ) | CAUSE                           |
| v.                          | ) |                                 |
|                             | ) |                                 |
| COUNTY OF KERN, et al.,     | ) |                                 |
|                             | ) |                                 |
| Defendants.                 | ) |                                 |
|                             | ) |                                 |

On June 19, 2017, the Court ordered the plaintiffs to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for her failure to serve the defendants with the summonses and complaint. (Doc. 10) The Court allowed that in lieu of responding to the OSC, the plaintiff could file proof of service of the action. *Id.* The plaintiff has now filed proofs of service.<sup>1</sup> (Docs. 11-14) Therefore, the Court **DISCHARGES** the order to show cause.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 29, 2017

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

<sup>1</sup>Except for the service on the County of Kern, service on the individuals appears improper. Not only does the service appear to fail with California law related to substitute service but the form itself is incomplete. Moreover, of course, in this action in which the plaintiff seeks to invoke this Court’s original jurisdiction, service must occur according to the provisions of Fed. R. Civ. P. 4. However, because it is possible the defendants will waiver proper service, the Court will not take any action at this time. In taking no action, the Court does not suggest that plaintiff has complied with Fed.R.Civ.P.4(m); indeed, the remedies set forth in that section are still very much in play.