

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

MALCOLM L. GRAY,)	2:07-CV-01379-PMP-VCF
	}	
Plaintiff,	}	
	}	
vs.	}	<u>ORDER</u>
	}	
HOWARD SKOLNIK, et al.,	}	
	}	
Defendants.	}	

On October 25, 2011, the Court entered an Order (Doc. #52) requiring that Plaintiff Gray show cause in writing which of the Defendants in this action have in fact been properly served with Plaintiff’s Complaint, alternatively to show cause why Plaintiff’s Complaint should not be dismissed as to those Defendants who have not been timely served.

On December 1, 2011, Plaintiff Gray filed a “Motion to Show Cause Why Plaintiff’s Complaint Should Not Be Dismissed” (Doc. #53). In his “Motion”, Plaintiff Gray argues that he did effect service on specified Defendants as reflected in the Certificates of Service filed August 21, 2008 (Docs. ## 21-26, inclusive) and that said Defendants should be deemed to have been effectively served. It is unclear to the Court that appropriate service has been effected, but the Court also finds that Plaintiff has raised a colorable issue as to whether they have.

///

1 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Clerk of Court shall forthwith
2 cause notice to issue to the Attorney General for the State of Nevada and the
3 Director of the Nevada Department of Corrections for the State of Nevada to enter a
4 Special Appearance, not later than January 31, 2012, and to respond to Plaintiff
5 Gray's Motion (Doc. #53) filed December 1, 2011.

6
7 DATED: December 15, 2011.
8
9

10
11 

12 PHILIP M. PRO
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26