

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTIE HOLLOWELL,
Plaintiff,
v.
ALLIANCE BANCORP, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

No. 10-1658 MMC


**ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO
SHOW CAUSE WHY CLAIMS AGAINST
UNSERVED DEFENDANTS SHOULD
NOT BE DISMISSED**

“If a defendant is not served within 120 days after the complaint is filed, the court – on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff – must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time.”
Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

On February 18, 2011, plaintiff filed her First Amended Complaint (“FAC”), naming therein the following two additional defendants: Mortgage Electronic Registration System, Inc. (“MERS”) and Quality Loan Services Corporation (“Quality”). To date, plaintiff has not filed proof of service of the summons and FAC upon either MERS or Quality. Pursuant to Rule 4(m), plaintiff is hereby ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, in writing and no later than July 1, 2011, why plaintiff’s claims against MERS and Quality should not be dismissed for failure to serve within the time required by Rule 4(m).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 22, 2011


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge