

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**

RESHMA KAMATH,
Plaintiff,
v.
BERNARD C BARMANN, et al.,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:23-cv-00461 JLT CDB
ORDER DISMISSING DOE DEFENDANT
ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO
CLOSE CASE

Plaintiff, attorney Reshma Kamath, brought this suit against the Kern County Superior Court; Kern County Superior Court Judge Bernard C. Barmann, Jr.; the Presiding Judge of that Court, Eric Bradshaw; and an unnamed Deputy Sheriff. (*See generally* Doc. 1.) On May 13, 2024, the Court dismissed all claims against Judge Barmann, Presiding Judge Bradshaw, and the Superior Court without leave to amend. (Doc. 19.) In that same order, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause within 21 days why the remaining defendant should not be dismissed:

The record reflects that the unnamed Deputy Sheriff defendant has not entered an appearance in this case. (*See* Docket; *see also* Doc. 13 at 18 (plaintiff conceding as much).) There is no evidence on the docket that the unnamed Deputy has been served. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) provides that “[i]f a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court--on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff--must 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.” *See also Flores v. Los Angeles Cnty. Sheriff’s*

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

Accordingly, the remaining claims in the Complaint are **DISMISSED**, and the Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE THIS CASE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **June 5, 2024**


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE