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

LEONARD A. HASKINS,

No. C 08-02226 CW (PR)

Plaintiff,

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO PROVIDE CURRENT ADDRESS NECESSARY TO LOCATE DEFENDANT

v.

J. RICHARD MENDIUS, M.D.

ROBERT AYERS JR., et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed the present pro se prisoner complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court issued an Order of Service.

Service has been ineffective on Defendant J. Richard Mendius, M.D. The Court has been informed that the litigation coordinator at San Quentin State Prison has been unable to locate Defendant Mendius at his last known address.

Because Plaintiff is proceeding in forma pauperis (IFP), he is responsible for providing the Court with current addresses for all Defendants so that service can be accomplished. See Walker v.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Sumner, 14 F.3d 1415, 1422 (9th Cir. 1994); Sellers v. United
States, 902 F.2d 598, 603 (7th Cir. 1990).

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m), if a complaint is not served within 120 days from the filing of the complaint, it may be dismissed without prejudice for failure of service. When advised of a problem accomplishing service, a pro se litigant proceeding IFP must "attempt to remedy any apparent defects of which [he] has knowledge." Rochon v. Dawson, 828 F.2d 1107, 1110 (5th Cir. 1987). If the marshal is unable to effectuate service through no fault of his own, e.g., because the plaintiff failed to provide sufficient information or because the defendant is not where the plaintiff claims, and the plaintiff is informed, the plaintiff must seek to remedy the situation or face dismissal. See Walker, 14 F.3d at 1421-22 (prisoner failed to show cause why claims against prison official should not be dismissed under Rule 4(m) because prisoner did not prove that he provided marshal with sufficient information to serve official or that he requested that official be served); see also Del Raine v. Williford, 32 F.3d 1024, 1029-31 (7th Cir. 1994) (prisoner failed to show good cause for failing to effect timely service on defendant because plaintiff did not provide marshal with copy of amended complaint until after more than 120 days after it was filed).

Service on Defendant Mendius has been attempted and has failed.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order, Plaintiff must provide the Court with a current address, necessary to locate Defendant Mendius. Failure to do so

For the Northern District of California **United States District Court**

shall result in the dismissal of all claims against Defendant
Mendius. If Plaintiff provides the Court with a current address
service shall again be attempted. If service fails a second time
all claims against Defendant Mendius shall be dismissed.
IT IS SO ORDERED.
Dated: 2/9/10 Chadistics Digmond Hinds

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

1						
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
3	LEONARD A HASKINS, Case Number: CV08-02226 CW					
5	Plaintiff, CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE v.					
6	ROBERT AYERS JR et al,					
7	Defendant.					
9		strict				
10	Court, Northern District of California.					
11	copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing	said				
12	in the Clerk's office.	ated				
13 14						
15 16	Leonard A. Haskins B96040 San Quentin State Prison					
17	Dated: February 9, 2010					
18	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Sheilah Cahill, Deputy Clerk					
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
2425						
-						