

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential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)