

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

EARL DEAN ALLEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

T MOBILE, ATT, and Verizon,

Defendants.

Civ. No. 6:14-cv-01206-MC


OPINION AND ORDER

MCSHANE, Judge:

Plaintiff, *pro se*, filed a complaint against T-Mobile, AT&T, and Verizon on July 28, 2014. Pl.'s Compl. 1–5, ECF No. 1. On August 1, 2014, this Court issued an opinion dismissing plaintiff's complaint for failure to state a claim. Order 1–3, ECF No. 6. In consideration of plaintiff's *pro se* status, this Court granted plaintiff until September 2, 2014 “to file an amended complaint curing the deficiencies identified.” *Id.* at 3.¹ Plaintiff has not taken additional action since that time. Accordingly, because plaintiff failed to comply with this Court's order, ECF No. 6, this action is dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 5th day of September, 2014.


Michael J. McShane
United States District Judge

¹ The copy of this order (ECF No.6) sent to plaintiff was returned as “not deliverable as addressed.” Mail Returned, ECF No. 8; *see also* Local Rule 83-10 (“[E]very unrepresented party[] has a continuing responsibility to notify the Clerk's Office whenever his or her mailing address, telephone number, and/or business e-mail address changes.”).