

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

NOEL KEITH WATKINS,
Plaintiff,
v.
VAMIL SINGH, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:13-cv-0416 WBS CKD P

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS


On June 3, 2013, the court found that service of process was appropriate for defendants Bick, Dillon, Lieu and Steevers. The court ordered that plaintiff complete the forms necessary for service of process and return them to the court within 30 days. Although defendants Bick and Dillon waived service and have answered the complaint, plaintiff has been unable to complete the forms necessary for service of defendants Lieu and Steevers because he is unable to ascertain a current address for either defendant. Because it does not appear that service of process with respect to defendants Lieu or Steevers is likely to occur, the court will recommend that they be dismissed without prejudice. See Fed R. Civ. P. 4(m).

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that defendants Lieu and Steevers be dismissed without prejudice.

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)(1). Within fourteen days

1 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written
2 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned
3 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Any response to the
4 objections shall be served and filed within fourteen days after service of the objections. The
5 parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to
6 appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

7 Dated: December 24, 2013

8 
9 _____
10 CAROLYN K. DELANEY
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12
13 watk0416.fts
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28