

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

Jianzheng Xu v. BXMEX

Xu v. BXMEX · No. 2:25-cv-03384-SVW-PVC · Decided August 4, 2025

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL Case No.: 2:25-cv-03384-SVW-PVC Date: August 4, 2025 Title: Jianzheng Xu v. BXMEX et al Present: The Honorable STEPHEN V. WILSON, United States District Judge Daniel Tamayo N/A Deputy Clerk Court Reporter Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s): Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s): None Appearing None Appearing Proceedings: [In Chambers] Order To Show Cause Re: Dismissal for Lack of Prosecution Plaintiff(s) are ORDERED to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

Link v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626 (1962) (Court has inherent power to dismiss for lack of prosecution on its own motion). The below time period(s) has not been met. Accordingly, the Court, on its own motion, orders Plaintiff(s) to show cause, in writing, on or before August 14, 2025, why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. This matter will stand submitted upon the filing of Plaintiff(s) response.

See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78. Failure to respond will be deemed consent to the dismissal of the action. // // ☒ 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. Plaintiff(s) have failed to file a proof of service within 90 days of the filing of the Complaint on the following Defendant(s): BXMEX; Yong Shun Wang; Lin Yi; Ran; Jones Y.; Linyi 060800 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.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). IT IS SO ORDERED.