

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  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AMOS GBEINTOR, SR.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL,  
Defendant.

No. 2:16-cv-1122 KJM GGH PS

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By order filed July 7, 2016, plaintiff’s complaint was dismissed and twenty-eight days leave to file an amended complaint and an in forma pauperis application or pay the filing fee was granted. In that order, the court informed plaintiff of the deficiencies in his complaint. The twenty-eight day period has now expired, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint, an in forma pauperis application or paid the filing fee, or otherwise responded to the court’s order.

Plaintiff has apparently decided to rest on the dismissed complaint. For the reasons given in the July 7, 2016, order, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed with 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 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

1 and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the  
2 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951  
3 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

4 Dated: August 10, 2016

5 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows

6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7

8 GGH:076/Gbeintor1122.fta

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28