3 4 5

7

8

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

6

1

2

9

10 MICHAEL CHESS,

11 Plair

Plaintiff, No. CIV S-07-1767 LKK DAD P

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VS.

13 J. DOVEY, et al.,

14 Defendants. <u>FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with this civil rights action.

On June 13, 2008, the court ordered the United States Marshal to serve plaintiff's complaint on ten defendants. The Marshal was unable to effect service on defendant Reid, so on March 20, 2009, the court advised plaintiff that if he wished to proceed with his claims against defendant Reid, he would be required to provide additional information to the court that would enable the United States Marshal to serve this defendant. The court instructed plaintiff to promptly seek such information through any means available to him and cautioned plaintiff that when service of a complaint is not made upon a defendant within 120 days after the complaint was filed, the court may be required to dismiss the plaintiff's claims against that defendant. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). The court also ordered plaintiff to submit within thirty days the documents

necessary to effect service on defendant Reid. Plaintiff timely submitted the necessary service documents. However, once again, based on the information plaintiff provided to the court the Marshal was unable to effect service on defendant Reid.

Under the circumstances of this case, the undersigned finds that plaintiff cannot show good cause for the failure to effect service on defendant Reid. Although plaintiff has had more than sufficient time to provide the court with the additional information necessary to enable the United States Marshal to serve this defendant, on two separate occasions plaintiff has failed to provide the court with a current address for the defendant. Accordingly, the court concludes that defendant Reid should be dismissed from this action. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

For the reasons discussed above, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that defendant Reid be dismissed from this action without prejudice. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) and 41(b).

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within twenty days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

DATED: September 30, 2009.

DAD:9 ches1767.56

DALE A. DROZD

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

A Dugal