

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Cassandra L. Johnson v. Louis DeJoy, et al.

Johnson v. DeJoy · No. 2:25-cv-1058-DAD-JDP (PS) · Decided November 19, 2025

OPINION

Lewis

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 CASSANDRA L. JOHNSON, Case No. 2:25-cv-1058-DAD-JDP (PS) 12 Plaintiff,

13 v. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

14 LOUIS DEJOY, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff commenced this action in April 2025. To
date, none of the defendants have 18 appeared in this action, and plaintiff has not filed proofs of
service demonstrating that defendants 19 were properly served. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(l). 20 Under
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m), “[i]f a defendant is not served within 90 days 21 after the
complaint is filed, the court—on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must 22
dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a
23 specified time.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). However, “if the plaintiff shows good cause for the 24
failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period.” Id. Although a pro 25
se litigants are generally afforded more latitude than one represented by counsel, a party’s pro se
26 status does not constitute “good cause” for failing to timely effect service. See King v. Atiyeh,
27 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987) (“Pro se litigants must follow the same rules of procedure
that 28 govern other litigants.”); Townsel v. Contra Costa Cnty., 820 F.2d 319, 320 (9th Cir. 1987)
1 | (holding that ignorance of service requirements does not constitute “good cause” for failure to
2 | timely effect service); see also E.D. Cal. L.R. 183(a) (“Any individual representing himself or
3 | herself without an attorney is bound by the Federal Rules of Civil or Criminal Procedure, these
4 | Rules, and all other applicable law.”). 5 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that: 6 1. Plaintiff
shall show cause within fourteen days from the date of this order why this 7 | action should not be
dismissed for failure to effect service of process within the time prescribed 8 | by Rule 4(m). 9 2.
Plaintiff is warned that failure to respond to this order will result in a recommendation 10 | that
this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to effect services of process. 11 IT IS SO
ORDERED. Dated: _ November 19, 2025 Q_—.

14 JEREMY D. PETERSON

15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/cassandra-l-johnson-v-louis-dejoy-et-al-2sqgtke0>