

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TERRELL D. HALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY JAIL, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:13-cv-0324 AC P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a former county and current state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has consented to the jurisdiction of the undersigned magistrate judge for all purposes pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) and Local Rule 305(a). ECF No. 4.


By order filed July 13, 2016, plaintiff was directed to complete and return to the court, within thirty days, the USM-285 forms and copies of his complaint which were required to effect service on defendants Diaz, Coblen, Lopez, and Nelson. ECF No. 88. If he was unable to complete a USM-285 form for any defendant, he was to show cause why that defendant should not be dismissed for failure to complete service. Id. Plaintiff returned completed forms for defendants Coplin¹ and Diaz (ECF No. 89), but did not submit forms for defendants Lopez and

¹ When ordered to provide additional information on the unserved defendants, counsel stated that (continued)

1 Nelson or show cause why they should not be dismissed. Plaintiff was given an additional thirty
2 days to show cause why defendants Lopez and Nelson should not be dismissed. ECF No. 104.
3 He was also advised that he could alternatively file a notice of voluntary dismissal of his claims
4 against Lopez and Nelson without prejudice if he was no longer seeking to pursue those claims at
5 this time. Id. Thirty days have now passed and plaintiff has not responded to the order.

6 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendants Lopez and Nelson are
7 dismissed without prejudice for failure to timely effect service of process and failure to follow
8 court orders. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m); Local Rule 110.

9 DATED: October 18, 2016

10 
11 ALLISON CLAIRE
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 the jail was unable to identify a correctional employee by the name of “Coblen,” but had
27 identified an officer “Coplin.” ECF No. 59. Plaintiff was directed to complete the USM-285
28 form for officer Coplin if he believed Coplin was the same individual he had made claims against.
ECF No. 88.