

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

Kouth Nakharath,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	Case No. 2:14-cv-2135
Bounpone Vathananonh, et al.,	:	JUDGE JAMES L. GRAHAM
Defendants.	:	Magistrate Judge Kemp

ORDER

Plaintiff has filed a motion notifying the Court that she has changed her phone number and a motion requesting that the Court assist her in finding the address of one of the named defendants.

The Court construes plaintiff's first motion as a notice updating her contact information and the filing (Doc. 4) shall be removed from the Court's pending motions list.

With respect to plaintiff's second motion, "[d]istrict judges have no obligation to act as counsel or paralegal to pro se litigants.'" Thomas v. Romanowski, 362 Fed.Appx. 452 (6th Cir. 2010), quoting Pliler v. Ford, 542 U.S. 225, 231 (2004). "As an impartial decisionmaker, it is not a federal judge's role or responsibility to track down a defendant's address so a plaintiff may serve process." Johnson v. Clark, 2013 WL 646022, at *5 (D.Ariz. February 21, 2013). "This degree of involvement 'would undermine [trial] judges' role as impartial decisionmakers.'" Id., quoting Pliler, 542 U.S. at 231. Consequently, plaintiff's second motion (Doc. 7) is denied.

Further, plaintiff is advised that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) provides, in relevant part:

If a defendant is not served within 120

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.

/s/ Terence P. Kemp
United States Magistrate Judge