

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

TROY SUTTON,

Plaintiff,

-against-

ERIC ADAMS; CITY OF NEW YORK,

Defendants.

23-CV-3880 (JPO)

ORDER OF SERVICE

J. PAUL OETKEN, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, who is appearing *pro se*, alleges that he was fired, in violation of rights, for failing to comply with a requirement that New York City employees be vaccinated against Covid-19. By order dated May 9, 2023, the Court granted Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP), that is, without prepayment of fees.

**DISCUSSION**

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, Plaintiff is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service. *Walker v. Schult*, 717 F.3d 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) ("The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases."); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP)).

Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that the summons and complaint be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served the summons and complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that a summons be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date the summons is issued. If the complaint is not served within that time, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*, 682 F.3d

56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff's responsibility to request an extension of time for service); *see also Murray v. Pataki*, 378 F. App'x 50, 52 (2d Cir. 2010) ("As long as the [plaintiff proceeding IFP] provides the information necessary to identify the defendant, the Marshals' failure to effect service automatically constitutes 'good cause' for an extension of time within the meaning of Rule 4(m).").

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendants City of New York and Mayor Eric Adams through the U.S. Marshals Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return form (USM-285 form) for each of these defendants. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue a summons and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals Service to effect service upon these defendants.

Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if Plaintiff's address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

### **CONCLUSION**

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail an information package to Plaintiff.

The Clerk of Court is further instructed to complete the USM-285 forms with the addresses for Defendants City of New York and Mayor Eric Adams and deliver to the U.S. Marshals Service all documents necessary to effect service.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an

appeal. *Cf. Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that an appellant demonstrates good faith when he seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 18, 2023  
New York, New York



---

J. PAUL OETKEN  
United States District Judge

## **DEFENDANTS AND SERVICE ADDRESSES**

1. City of New York  
New York City Law Department  
100 Church Street  
New York, NY 10007
2. Mayor Eric Adams  
New York City Law Department  
100 Church Street  
New York, NY 10007