Doc. 22

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	DEMETRIUS A. WRIGHT, No. C 10-00064 CW (PR)
5	Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DISMISS WITHOUT
6 7	v. PREJUDICE ALL CLAIMS AGAINST DEFENDANT LVN HERNANDEZ
, O	R. CARASCO, et al.,
8	Defendants/
9 10	

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed the present pro se prisoner complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court issued an Order of 12 Service.

13 Defendant Licensed Vocational Nurse (LVN) Hernandez has not 14 been served in this action. The Court has been informed that the 15 litigation coordinator at Salinas Valley State Prison has been 16 unable to locate Defendant Hernandez.

17 As Plaintiff is proceeding in forma pauperis (IFP), he is 18 responsible for providing the Court with current addresses for all 19 Defendants so that service can be accomplished. See Walker v. 20 Sumner, 14 F.3d 1415, 1422 (9th Cir. 1994); Sellers v. United 21 States, 902 F.2d 598, 603 (7th Cir. 1990).

22 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m), if a 23 complaint is not served within 120 days from the filing of the 24 complaint, it may be dismissed without prejudice for failure of 25 service. When advised of a problem accomplishing service, a pro se 26 litigant proceeding IFP must "attempt to remedy any apparent 27 defects of which [he] has knowledge." Rochon v. Dawson, 828 F.2d 28

11

1 1107, 1110 (5th Cir. 1987). If the marshal is unable to effectuate 2 service through no fault of his own, e.g., because the plaintiff 3 failed to provide sufficient information, the plaintiff must seek to remedy the situation or face dismissal. See Walker, 14 F.3d at 4 5 1421-22 (prisoner failed to show cause why complaint against prison official should not be dismissed under Rule 4(m) because prisoner 6 7 did not prove that he provided marshal with sufficient information 8 to serve official or that he requested that official be served).

9 In an Order dated March 3, 2011, the Court informed Plaintiff that service had been ineffective on Defendant Hernandez and 10 11 directed Plaintiff to provide the Court with the required 12 information necessary to identify Defendant Hernandez within thirty 13 days of the Order. Thirty days have passed, and Plaintiff has 14 failed to provide the Court with the aforementioned required 15 information. Instead, Plaintiff has filed a "Motion to Dismiss LVN 16 Hernandez From the Complaint Without Prejudice" (docket no. 21).

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion (docket no. 21) is GRANTED and all claims against Defendant Hernandez are DISMISSED without prejudice under Rule 4(m).

This Order terminates Docket no. 21.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4/12/2012

1. I. Sten

CLAUDIA WILKEN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3 4 5	DEMETRIUS A. WRIGHT, Plaintiff, V. Case Number: CV10-00064 CW CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
6 7 8	R. CARASCO et al, Defendant.
9 10	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
11 12 13	That on April 12, 2011, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.
14 15 16	Demetrius Ahmed Wright T65802 Salinas Valley State Prison P.O. Box 1050 Soledad, CA 93960
17 18 19	Dated: April 12, 2011 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Nikki Riley, Deputy Clerk
20 21 22	
23 24	
25 26 27	
27 28	3

United States District Court For the Northern District of California