1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JAVIER SOLIS,	No. 2:14-cv-00686-KJM-AC
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	TARGET CORPORATION, a corporation,	
15	and DOES 1-100, inclusive,	
16	Defendants.	
17		
18	On May 5, 2016, the court ordered plaintiff to show cause why the court should	
19	not dismiss the "Doe" defendants. ECF No. 77. Plaintiff has not responded to the court's order.	
20	The court construes plaintiff's lack of response as a concession, and therefore DISMISSES the	
21	unnamed defendants under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m)	
22	(providing for dismissal of defendants not served within ninety days of filing of the complaint	
23	unless the plaintiff shows good cause); see also Glass v. Fields, No. 1:09-00098, 2011 U.S. Dist.	
24	LEXIS 97604 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2011); Hard Drive Prods. v. Does, No. 11-01567, 2011 U.S.	
25	Dist. LEXIS 109837, at *2-4 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2011).	
26	IT IS SO ORDERED.	$1 \sim 0 \sim 1 \sim 1$
27	DATED: June 7, 2016	Amile
28		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
		1