

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  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

RICKEY DONNELL BOYD,	)	No. CV 06-08069-DOC (VBK)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	AMENDED ORDER (1) ACCEPTING AND
	)	ADOPTING THE REPORT AND
v.	)	RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED
	)	STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE, AND (2)
BARRON, et al.,	)	DISMISSING THE FIRST AMENDED
	)	COMPLAINT
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has reviewed the First Amended Complaint and all other papers along with the attached Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, and has made a de novo determination of the Report and Recommendation.

Judgment dismissing the First Amended Complaint was entered on July 27, 2010. [Docket No. 44.]

Due to a systems error, the Court reopened the case on November 22, 2010. [Docket No. 45.] Plaintiff was re-served with copies of the "Notice of Filing of Report and Recommendation" [Docket No. 41], "Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge" granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and advising Plaintiff that Objections were due 20 days later [Docket No. 42], and an "Order Vacating Judgment" [Docket No. 45].

1 On December 13, 2010, the Court received the mail addressed to  
2 Plaintiff returned with a notation "Return to Sender" and "Discharged  
3 From CDCR Custody. No Forwarding.". (Docket No. 47.)

4 On December 16, 2010, the Court issued a Minute Order advising  
5 Plaintiff that Judgment had been vacated and granting Plaintiff twenty  
6 days from the date of the Minute Order in which to file Objections to  
7 the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge  
8 [Docket No. 46].

9 On January 3, 2011, the Court received the mail addressed to  
10 Plaintiff once again returned with a notation "Return to Sender" and  
11 "I/M Discharged. No Forwarding Address on File.". (Docket No. 48.)

12 Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Central District of  
13 California's Local Rule 41-6. Plaintiff's failure to keep the Court  
14 apprised of his current address further supports dismissing the First  
15 Amended Complaint and entire action for failure to prosecute.

16 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that a Judgment be entered (1) approving  
17 and adopting the Report and Recommendation, (2) granting Defendant's  
18 Motion to Dismiss; and (3) dismissing the First Amended Complaint, and  
19 entire action, with prejudice.

20  
21 DATED: January 18, 2011



\_\_\_\_\_  
DAVID O. CARTER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE