

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

REVEREND HEIDI LEPP, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
YUBUD CHURCH, et al.
Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-1317-GEB-EFB PS

ORDER

Plaintiff Heidi Lepp requests that the court direct the United States Marshals Service to complete service of process on her behalf. ECF No. 14. For the following reasons, the request is denied.¹

On June 27, 2017, Ms. Lepp filed a complaint against defendants the County of Yuba, Jeremy Strange, and Chris Monaco, and paid the \$400 filing fee. The following week, plaintiff filed three proofs of service, purporting to demonstrate service of the summons and complaint on the three named defendants. ECF Nos. 4, 5, 6. Shortly thereafter, Ms. Lepp filed a first amended complaint, which names an additional 27 defendants and purports to add several plaintiffs. ECF No. 7. The amended complaint, however, is only signed by Ms. Lepp.

¹ Plaintiff’s request was styled as a “Declaration and Statement of Facts and Information of reverend heidi lepp Requested Under Seal.” Despite the title, Ms. Lepp did not file a request to file the document under seal in compliance with Local Rule 141.

1 Ms. Lepp now requests that the court direct the United States Marshals Service to serve
2 the newly named defendants. ECF No. 14. It is plaintiff's responsibility to serve each defendant
3 with a copy of the summons and complaint. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(1) ("The plaintiff is responsible
4 for having the summons and complaint served within the time allowed by Rule 4(m) and must
5 furnish the necessary copies to the person who makes service."). Although a court may, at the
6 plaintiff's request, order the marshal to complete service, the court is not obligated to grant such a
7 request. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) ("At the plaintiff's request, the court *may* order that service
8 be made by a United States marshal . . .") (emphasis added).

9 Ms. Lepp has failed to demonstrate any basis for her request. In fact, the three proofs of
10 service she has already filed in this action strongly suggest that she is capable of serving all
11 defendants named in the amended complaint.² Accordingly, plaintiff's request for an order
12 directing the marshal to complete service of process (ECF No. 14) is denied.

13 DATED: April 8, 2017.

14 
15 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 _____
28 ² At this time, the court makes no findings as to the sufficiency of service of process on
defendants Yuba County, Jeremy Strange, and Chris Monaco.