

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

SaaHdi Abdul Coleman v. California Department of Corrections and
Rehabilitation

Coleman · No. 2:21-cv-00625-TLN-EFB (PC) · Decided September 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The document contains findings and recommendations in a prisoner civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The magistrate judge recommends dismissing the claims against defendant Tyler without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) because repeated attempts to obtain service information were unsuccessful and the plaintiff failed to respond to the court’s latest order. The plaintiff was advised of the opportunity to file objections within fourteen days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Edmund F. Brennan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 18, 2025
DOCKET	2:21-cv-00625-TLN-EFB (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Findings and recommendations in a prisoner civil-rights action recommending dismissal without prejudice of claims against defendant Tyler for failure to provide information necessary for service of process and failure to respond to a court order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	SaaHdi Abdul Coleman v. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation

TOPICS

- service of process
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights
- service of process

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff's claims against defendant Tyler should be dismissed without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) after repeated unsuccessful attempts at service and plaintiff's failure to comply with an order requiring information needed for service.

HOLDINGS

1. The magistrate judge recommended that plaintiff's claims against defendant Tyler be dismissed without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) because plaintiff failed to provide updated information necessary for service and failed to respond to the court's order.
2. The court advised that failure to file objections within fourteen days may waive the right to appeal the district court's order.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is incarcerated and proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in a civil-rights action. Multiple attempts to serve defendant Tyler failed. Despite repeated requests and a May 29, 2025 order requiring updated service information within 60 days, plaintiff neither supplied the information nor responded.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff brought an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 while proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. After several unsuccessful attempts to serve defendant Tyler, the court repeatedly sought sufficient service information and most recently ordered plaintiff on May 29, 2025, to provide updated information within 60 days. Plaintiff did not provide the information or otherwise respond, prompting the magistrate judge to recommend dismissal without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). The recommendation was to be submitted to the assigned district judge, subject to objections within fourteen days.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Martinez v. Yist, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

SaaHdi Abdul Coleman v. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation
PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 SAAHDI ABDUL COLEMAN, No. 2:21-cv-00625-TLN-EFB (PC)

12 Plaintiff,
13 v. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
14 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS AND
15 REHABILITATION,
16 Defendants. 17

18 Plaintiff is a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action 19
under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 20 Several attempts to serve defendant Tyler have failed. The court has
solicited sufficient 21 information for service of process on defendant Tyler many times, most
recently on May 29, 22 2025, when the court ordered plaintiff to provide such information within
60 days. ECF No. 93; 23 see also ECF Nos. 41, 45, 51, 75, 85. Plaintiff has not provided the
updated information or 24 otherwise responded to the order. 25 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY
RECOMMENDED that plaintiff's claims against defendant 26 Tyler be dismissed without
prejudice. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). 27 These findings and recommendations will be submitted to
the United States District Judge 28 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §
636(b)(1). Within fourteen days 1 | after being served with these findings and recommendations,
plaintiff may file written objections 2 || with the court. The document should be captioned
"Objections to Findings and 3 || Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file
objections within the specified time 4 | may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order.
Martinez v. Yist, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 5 | 1991). 7 || Dated: September 17, 2025 □□□ biel FT
eLACL*

EDMUND F. BRENNAN

8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28