

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Alertone Service, Inc. v. RQ Construction, LLC

Alertone Service · No. 1:25-cv-00493-CDB · Decided July 21, 2025

OPINION

Alertone Service, Inc. v. RQ Construction, LLC

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 ALERTONE SERVICE, INC.,

Case No. 1:25-cv-00493-CDB 12 Plaintiff,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY

SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED

13 v.

FOR PLAINTIFF’S FAILURE TO

PROSECUTE THIS ACTION AND TO

14 RQ CONSTRUCTION, LLC,

COMPLY WITH THE COURT’S ORDERS

15 Defendant.

ORDER CONTINUING THE

MANDATORY SCHEDULING

16

CONFERENCE

17

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO

EFFECT SERVICE OF THIS ORDER AND

18

TO FILE PROOF OF SERVICE

19

FIVE-DAY DEADLINE

20 21 Plaintiff Alertone Service, Inc. (“Plaintiff”), initiated this action with the filing of a 22
complaint on April 28, 2025. (Doc. 1). The next day, the Clerk of the Court issued summons for
23 service upon Defendant RQ Construction, LLC, and the Court entered an order setting a 24

mandatory scheduling conference for July 28, 2025. (Docs. 2-3). The Court's order directed Plaintiff to "diligently pursue service of summons and complaint" and "promptly file proofs of service." (Doc. 3 at 1). The order further advised Plaintiff that failure to diligently prosecute this action "may result in the imposition of sanctions, including the dismissal of unserved defendants." Id. To date, Plaintiff has not filed proofs of service nor any report setting forth an explanation for the failure, and no Defendant has appeared in the action. Local Rule 110 provides that "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions...within the inherent power of the Court." The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action. *Bautista v. Los Angeles County*, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000). In addition, Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides: "If a defendant is not served within 90 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." Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). Absent a showing of good cause, failure to comply with Rule 4(m) requires dismissal of any unserved defendant. Conclusion and Order Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within five (5) days of entry of this order, Plaintiff SHALL show cause in writing why sanctions should not be imposed — including dismissal of any unserved Defendant or this action in its entirety — for Plaintiff's failure to prosecute, failure to serve the summons and complaint in a timely manner, and failure to promptly file proof of service. Filing summons returned executed following entry of this order WILL NOT relieve Plaintiff of its obligation to respond to this order in writing. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the scheduling conference previously set for July 28, 2025, is CONTINUED to September 11, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. And IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall serve a copy of this order on Defendant within five (5) days of entry of this order and promptly file proof of service thereof. Any failure by Plaintiff to timely respond to this order to show cause will result in the imposition of sanctions, including a recommendation to dismiss this action. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: _ July 21, 2025 | br Pr
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

28