

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SAMUEL E. AUSTIN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CITY OF OAKLAND., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 17-CV-03284 YGR

**ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO PROVIDE
SERVICE INFORMATION; SETTING CASE
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

Pro se plaintiff Samuel E. Austin filed the present lawsuit on June 7, 2017, which was initially assigned to Magistrate Judge Elizabeth D. Laporte. (Dkt. No. 1.) On June 13, 2017, Judge Laporte granted Austin's request to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and apprised him of his "responsibility to serve the complaint and any amendments, scheduling orders, attachments, pursuant to Rule 4, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure." (Dkt. No. 5 at 2.) On June 19, 2017, the case was reassigned to this Court. (Dkt. No. 8.)

It is the responsibility of the plaintiff to provide sufficient information to ensure prosecution of his action. To date, plaintiff has not provided the addresses of each of the defendants for service. The Court therefore **ORDERS** that Austin shall file, no later than **October 19, 2017**, either: (1) a statement listing the names and addresses of the defendants to be served; or (2) a motion for additional time explaining the reasons why such information cannot be provided. **Should Austin fail**

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1 **to comply with this deadline, this action will be dismissed against all defendants without**
2 **prejudice for failure to serve and prosecute.** Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).¹

3 A Case Management Conference shall be held in this case on **Monday, December 11, 2017,**
4 at 2:00 p.m., in Courtroom 1 of the United States Courthouse located at 1301 Clay Street in Oakland,
5 California. The parties shall file a joint case management conference statement seven days in
6 advance of the case management conference date. The statement must include all elements requested
7 in the “Standing Order for All Judges of the Northern District of California – Contents of Joint Case
8 Management Statement.”

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Date: September 21, 2017



YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

24 ¹ The Court further notes that plaintiff must keep the Court informed of any change of address
25 and must comply with the Court’s orders in a timely fashion. Pursuant to Northern District Local
26 Rule 3-11 a party proceeding *pro se* whose address changes while an action is pending must promptly
27 file a notice of change of address specifying the new address. See L.R. 3-11(a). The Court may
28 dismiss without prejudice a complaint when mail directed to the *pro se* party by the Court has been
returned to the Court as not deliverable, and the Court does not receive, within sixty days of such a
return, any written communication from the *pro se* party indicating a current address. See L.R. 3-
11(b).