

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

JONATHAN WRINKLES, et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	CIVIL ACTION
v.)	No. 05-2060-KHV
)	
THE COUNTY COMMISSION OF)	
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, KANSAS,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

ORDER

On February 4, 2005, plaintiffs filed a class action complaint against the County Commission of Montgomery County, Kansas for violation of constitutional rights. See Doc. #1. On June 22, 2005, the Court ordered plaintiffs to show good cause in writing why service of the summons and complaint had not been made within 120 days from the filing of the complaint, and further show good cause in writing why plaintiffs' claims should not be dismissed in their entirety without prejudice. See Doc. #2. This matter comes before the Court on plaintiffs' response to the show cause order. See Doc. #3.

In response to the show cause order, plaintiffs state that they have been investigating the merit of their claims. They request an additional 30 days to complete the review. On this record, the Court finds that plaintiffs have shown good cause why the case should not be dismissed. Pursuant to Rule 4(m), Fed. R. Civ. P., the Court will extend to August 1, 2005 the time for plaintiffs to serve the summons and complaint.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiffs have shown good cause why the case should not be dismissed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the time for plaintiffs to serve the summons and complaint is extended to **August 1, 2005**. No further extensions shall be granted for plaintiffs to investigate the merit of their claims. This process should have commenced well before plaintiffs filed suit. Having filed suit, plaintiffs should proceed forthwith.

Dated this 14th day of July, 2005 at Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ Kathryn H. Vratil
Kathryn H. Vratil
United States District Judge