

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM PHILLIP NEIDINGER,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-09-2031 DAD P

vs.

S.M. SALINAS, Warden,

ORDER AND

Respondent.

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

_____ /

By order filed March 23, 2010, petitioner was ordered to file an amended petition for a writ of habeas corpus within thirty days from the date of service of the order. The thirty day period has now expired, and petitioner has not filed an amended application or otherwise responded to the court's order.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is directed to randomly assign this case to a District Judge.

Also, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty-one days after being served with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file written

1 objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's
2 Findings and Recommendations." Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the
3 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951
4 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

5 DATED: May 6, 2010.

6
7 
8 _____
9 DALE A. DROZD
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 DAD:4
10 neid2031.fta

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26