

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

HYUN JU SHIN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
ROBERT YOUNG YOON, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:17-cv-01371-AWI-MJS  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION  
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE  
TO SERVE DEFENDANTS  
ORDER VACATING MARCH 29, 2018  
MANDATORY SCHEDULING CONFERENCE  
**FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE**

Plaintiff Hyun Ju Shin initiated this action on October 11, 2017 against Defendants Robert Young Yoon, Kyoung Mee Yoon, Kyoung Sup Yoon, Y&Y Property Management, Inc., the Victus Group, Inc., and Blackstone Seattle, LLC. (ECF No. 1.) Summons issued the following day. (ECF Nos. 3, 4.) An initial scheduling conference was set. (ECF No. 5.) The scheduling conference was vacated due to Plaintiffs' apparent failure to serve Defendants. (ECF No. 6.) Plaintiff was then reminded of the obligation to serve Defendants in compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). (Id.)

To date, the docket reflects no efforts to serve Defendants.

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 court--on motion or on its own

1 after notice to the plaintiff--must dismiss the action without prejudice against that  
2 defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows  
3 good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate  
4 period.”

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

11  
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: March 15, 2018

*/s/ Michael J. Seng*  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28