

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JANE DOE,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
TRADESHIFT, INC., et al.,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. 24-cv-00166-JST

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE:  
SERVICE**

This case was removed from San Francisco Superior Court on January 9, 2024. ECF No. 1. As of the date of this order, the docket reflects no evidence that the summons and complaint have been served on Defendants Koch Industries, Inc., Mikkell Brun, Gert Sylvest, Morten Lund, Morten Sondergaard, or King & Spalding International (“Unserved Defendants”).

Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides, in relevant part:

If a defendant is not served within 90 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. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

143 days have now passed since the removal of the complaint. Plaintiff is therefore ordered to show cause why this case should not be dismissed as to the Unserved Defendants for failure to serve.

Further, Plaintiff’s certificate of service on Defendant HSBC Holdings Plc, a United Kingdom business entity, states that that entity was served via CT Corporation Systems in California. ECF No. 25 at 1. “Service outside of the United States must be done in accordance

1 with Rule 4(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.” *Automattic Inc. v. Steiner*, 82 F. Supp. 3d  
2 1011, 1020 (N.D. Cal. 2015). As relevant here, Rule 4(f)(1) states that “[u]nless federal law  
3 provides otherwise, an individual—other than a minor, an incompetent person, or a person whose  
4 waiver has been filed—may be served at a place not within any judicial district of the United  
5 States . . . by any internationally agreed means of service that is reasonably calculated to give  
6 notice, such as those authorized by the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and  
7 Extrajudicial Documents.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(1). When responding to this order to show cause,  
8 Plaintiff must either affirmatively demonstrate that she has complied with this provision or show  
9 cause why Defendant HSBC Holdings Plc should not be dismissed from this action.

10 A written response to this order is due by June 7, 2024. If Plaintiff’s written response to  
11 the order to show cause is accompanied by satisfactory evidence that the summons and complaint  
12 have been properly served on the Unserved Defendants, the order to show cause will be withdrawn  
13 as to those defendants. With regard to Defendant HSBC Holdings Plc, the Court will take such  
14 further action as is appropriate based on the contents of Plaintiff’s written response.

15 Finally, the Court notes that Defendant Jeff Ransdell was served on February 16, 2024,  
16 ECF No. 26, but has not appeared in the action. Plaintiff must file a request for entry of default  
17 against Defendant Randell on or before June 20, 2024.

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19 Dated: June 5, 2024

20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 JON S. TIGAR  
23 United States District Judge  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28