

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ramales Photography LLC v. Pagerie LLC

Ramales Photography · No. CV 25-06920-SPG(MBKx) · Decided November 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Ramales Photography LLC to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. The court identified the failure to file proof of service on Pagerie LLC within 90 days and required a written response by December 9, 2025, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sherilyn Peace Garnett
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	November 24, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-06920-SPG(MBKx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution because Plaintiff had not filed proof of service on Defendant Pagerie LLC within 90 days after filing the complaint.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court exercised its inherent authority to dismiss for lack of prosecution and applied the 90-day service deadline and good-cause provision of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- service of process
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- copyright litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff should be required to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution based on the failure to file proof of service within 90 days after filing the complaint.
2. Whether Plaintiff could avoid dismissal by showing that service was completed within the 90-day period or that good cause existed for failing to complete service.

HOLDINGS

1. The court may act on its own motion to require Plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.
2. When a summons and complaint have not been served on a defendant within 90 days after filing the complaint, the plaintiff must show that service was timely completed or demonstrate good cause for the failure; absent good cause, dismissal without prejudice is required under Rule 4(m).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Absent a showing of good cause, an action must be dismissed without prejudice if the summons and complaint are not served on a Defendant within 90 days after the complaint is filed.” (1)

“Plaintiff(s) can satisfy this order by showing that service was effectuated within the 90 day deadline or by showing good cause for the failure to do so.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Rmales Photography LLC filed a civil action against Pagerie LLC. Plaintiff had not filed a proof of service showing that Pagerie LLC was served within 90 days after the complaint was filed. The court therefore ordered Plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a copyright-infringement action against Pagerie LLC. The court determined that Plaintiff had not filed proof of service within the 90-day period required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) and ordered Plaintiff to respond by December 9, 2025, either by showing that service was timely effectuated or by demonstrating good cause for the failure. The court had not yet dismissed the action.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Link v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626 (1962)