1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	JOUDON VAN HOPE-EL,	) Case No.: 1:18-cv-0441 - DAD - JLT )		
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER TERMINATING MOTIONS (Docs. 27, 28, 29)		
13	V.	) ) ORDER TO PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE WHY		
14	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, et al.,	) SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FOR		
15	Defendants.	) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH SERVICE RULES		
16	On May 29, 2018, the plaintiff filed affidavits of service indicating that the summons,			
17				
18	complaint and "Statement of Claim," were served by personal service on a person authorized to accept			
19 20	service at the "U.S. Department of Justice c/o U.S. Attorney General, Jefferson Session, U.S. Attorney			
20 21	General." (Doc. 7) On the same date, he filed a similar proof of service on the "U.S. Department of State."			
21		ication for the entry of default against the United States		
22	On July 19, 2018, Plaintiff filed an application for the entry of default against the United States Department of State. (Doc. 13) The Court denied entry of default and noted that the proofs of service			
23	were inadequate to demonstrate proper proof of service on the United States. (Doc. 18) The Court set			
25	forth the requirements of Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and described why the service			
26	was improper. <u>Id</u> . In response, the plaintiff filed documents, which, in essence, insist that service was			
27				
28				

1	proper. <sup>1</sup> (Docs. 20, 21, 22) On August 3, 2018, an Assistant United States Attorney filed a document		
2	iterating the position that the United States has not been properly served and that it would not respond		
3	until proper service was made. (Doc. 23) Despite this, the plaintiff has not effected proper service		
4	and, instead, has filed many other pleadings. The plaintiff is advised that the Court <b><u>will not</u></b> consider		
5	any of these filings or any future filings until proper service is made and the proper time for the		
6	defendant to respond has passed. Thus, the Court <b>ORDERS</b> :		
7	1.	Plaintiff's filings (Docs. 27, 28, 29) are TE	RMINATED;
8	2. <u>Within 21 days</u> , the plaintiff <b>SHALL</b> file proof of service of the summons and		
9		complaint, which demonstrates that the requ	uirements of Fed.R.Civ.P.4(a) have been
10		satisfied. Alternatively, within 21 days, he	SHALL show good cause in writing why
11		the action should not be dismissed for failur	re to comply with Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m);
12	3. Until the plaintiff has filed proof of service demonstrating proper and effective service		
13		on the defendant he SHALL NOT file any	further frivolous pleadings <sup>2</sup> .
14	The plaintiff is advised that his failure to comply with this order, and/or his failure to		
15	demonstrate good cause for his failure to effect proper service, SHALL result in a		
16	recommendation that this action be dismissed.		
17			
18	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
19	Dated:		s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
20		UNITED	) STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27	<sup>1</sup> Mr. Van Hope-el's analysis of the service he has made is incorrect. He is strongly urged to seek the advice of a lawyer of to conduct careful and thorough legal research to assist him in understanding the Court' prior order and Fed.R.Civ.P.4(a).		
28	<sup>2</sup> Thus far, nearly every filing the plaintiff has filed has been ill-advised, fails to comply with the Rules of Civil Procedure and are frivolous.		
		2	