UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VERNITA JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

SACRAMENTO SHERIFF DEPARTMENT,

Defendant.

No. 2:15-cv-2248 AC P (TEMP)

ORDER AND

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On November 12, 2015, the court ordered plaintiff to file an in forma pauperis affidavit or pay the appropriate filing fee within thirty days and cautioned plaintiff that failure to do so would result dismissal of this action without prejudice. The thirty-day period has now expired, and plaintiff has not responded to the court's order and has not filed an in forma pauperis affidavit or paid the appropriate filing fee.[1]

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

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge

[1] Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the court's order was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court apprised of her current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

DATED: January 5, 2016

ALLISON CLAIRE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE