

1 Second, defendants argue that this extension is warranted to permit *pro se* plaintiff time to
2 attempt service and to allow defendants to determine whether service has been properly effectuated.
3 The court finds the request reasonable provided that no service has been made to any federal
4 defendant other than Roos and Koen. Further, the court notes that plaintiff did not successfully serve
5 defendants Roos and Koen, in their individual capacities, with his previous complaint. This proposed
6 deadline would *pro se* permit plaintiff 30 days to effectuate service and federal defendants, sued in
7 their individual capacities, 60 days to respond. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(3).³ Provided the challenges
8 of serving federal government officials in their individual capacities internationally, the court finds
9 such delay warranted.

10 Third, counsel represents that he has only recently been assigned to the case because *pro se*
11 plaintiff has sued the Department of Justice attorneys who had been handling the lawsuit. Counsel
12 requests time to familiarize himself with this matter and to determine which newly named defendants
13 will be represented by the Department of Justice. The court finds the request reasonable.

14 Good cause appearing,

15 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that defendants' motion for
16 extension of time to respond to amended complaint (doc. # 135) be, and the same hereby is,
17 GRANTED.

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendants Roos and Koen have **up to, and including,**
19 **July 8, 2013**, to respond to plaintiff's amended complaint.

20 DATED April 8, 2013.

21
22 
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

24
25
26
27 ³ The court notes that under Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m), plaintiff is afforded 120 days from the day the complaint is
28 filed to serve defendants. This order does not constrain the time in which *pro se* plaintiff can serve defendants as
provided for under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.