

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION

DONALD BATES,

Plaintiff,

vs.

COUNTY OF ST. CHARLES, et al.,

Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Case No. 4:11CV00409 JCH

**ORDER**

Upon review of the record, the Court notes that the file contains no proof of service upon nor entry of appearance on behalf of Defendants **JOHN/JANE DOE WARD, JOHN/JANE DOE ARMSTEAD, JOHN/JANE DOE POWELL, JOHN/JANE DOE TITTLE, JOHN/JANE DOE NOSER, JOHN/JANE DOE SMITH, JOHN/JANE DOE DELAUM, JOHN/JANE DOE WARNER, JOHN/JANE DOE RICKER, JOHN/JANE DOE SNEE, JOHN/JANE DOE LYLES, JOHN/JANE DOE SCHROEDER, JOHN/JANE DOE WILLIAMS, JOHN/JANE DOE NANSEL, JOHN/JANE DOE TUBBINS, JOHN/JANE DOE PEREZ, JOHN/JANE DOE SCHNUR, JOHN/JANE DOE BRESSIE, JOHN/JANE DOE WILLIS, JOHN/JANE DOE ROBINSON, JOHN/JANE DOE ALLEN, JOHN/JANE DOE AIKINS, JOHN/JANE DOE BRAZEL, JOHN/JANE DOE PATTON, JOHN/JANE DOE KEPPEL, JOHN/JANE DOE BRAXTON, JOHN/JANE DOE PEARIRA, JOHN/JANE DOE JONES, JOHN/JANE DOE MCMEANANY, JOHN/JANE DOE CROSBY, JOHN/JANE DOE GONZALES, JOHN/JANE DOE ACKIGOZ, JOHN/JANE DOE REMY, JOHN/JANE DOE REYNOLDS, JOHN/JANE DOE EASTMAN, JOHN/JANE DOE BLANKENSHIP, JOHN/JANE DOE BUCKLES, JOHN/JANE DOE COPLELAND, JOHN/JANE DOE MCFARLAND, JOHN/JANE DOE**

LADD, JOHN/JANE DOE MARSDEN, JOHN/JANE DOE GLOVER, JOHN/JANE DOE SHANKS, JOHN/JANE DOE MORRIS, JOHN/JANE DOE FRANKLIN, JOHN/JANE DOE WALLACE, JOHN/JANE DOE DEMPSEY, JOHN/JANE DOE MCCORMICK, JOHN/JANE DOE MCGUIRE, JOHN/JANE DOE EADS, JOHN/JANE DOE SITTON, JOHN/JANE DOE SMITH, JOHN/JANE DOE IKE, JOHN/JANE DOE ZIKA, JOHN/JANE DOE ARMSTRONG, JOHN/JANE DOE COYLE, JOHN/JANE DOE PINKUS, JOHN/JANE DOE 1, JOHN/JANE DOE 2, JOHN/JANE DOE 3, JOHN/JANE DOE 4, or JOHN/JANE DOE 5. Because it does not appear that service of the complaint has been made timely, within 120 days after the filing of the complaint on **March 4, 2011**,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that, pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m), Plaintiff shall show cause in writing, within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Order, why this action should not be dismissed without prejudice as to the defendants named above for lack of timely service.

Dated this 16th day of August, 2011.

/s/Jean C. Hamilton

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE