1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DIS	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11	MALIK JONES,	No. C 09-03003 CW (PR)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO
13	v.	PROVIDE CURRENT ADDRESS NECESSARY TO LOCATE DEFENDANT E. RAMIREZ
14	L. WASHINGTON, et al.,	E. KAMIKEZ
15	Defendants.	
16	,	

complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On March 31, 2011, the Court issued an "Order Reviewing Second Amended Complaint; Dismissing All Claims Against Defendant P. Brown; Requiring Service on Defendants E. Ramirez and B. Brown; Addressing Plaintiff's Motion; and Allowing Further Briefing on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss."

Service has been ineffective on Defendant E. Ramirez. The Court has been informed that the Litigation Staff Service Analyst at Salinas Valley State Prison (SVSP) has been unable to locate Defendant Ramirez because "personnel records for the institution do not reflect employment of a person by this name." (Apr. 7, 2011 Letter from SVSP Litigation Staff Service Analyst A. Esparza at 1.)

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed the present pro se prisoner

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Because Plaintiff is proceeding <u>in forma pauperis</u> (IFP), he is responsible for providing the Court with current addresses for all Defendants so that service can be accomplished. <u>See Walker v. Sumner</u>, 14 F.3d 1415, 1422 (9th Cir. 1994); <u>Sellers v. United States</u>, 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 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 Ramirez has been attempted and has failed.

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

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 Ramirez. Failure to do so
shall result in the dismissal of all claims against Defendant
Ramirez. If Plaintiff provides the Court with a current address,
service shall again be attempted. If service fails a second time,
all claims against Defendant Ramirez shall be dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4/19/2011

Claudia WILKEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
3	MALIK JONES,	
4	Case Number: CV09-03003 CW Plaintiff,	
5	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE v.	
6	L. WASHINGTON et al,	
7	Defendant.	
8		
9	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. Districtor, Northern District of California.	
10		
11	copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing	
12		
13		
14		
15	Malik Jones K-09065 FC-0-3-116	
16	P.O. Box 1050 Soledad, CA 93960	
17	Dated: April 19, 2011	
18	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Nikki Riley, Deputy Clerk	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		