1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9	WESTERN DIVISION	
10	ALEX P. THORN,) Case No. CV 10-0703-DMG) (FMOx)
11	Plaintiff,) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
12	VS.) WHY ACTION SHOULD NOT) BE DISMISSED FOR LACK OF
13	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, MICROSOFT LICENSING, MICROSOFT CAPITAO CORPORATION,) PROSECUTION
14	CAPITAO CORPORATION,	
15	Defendants.	
16)

On February 2, 2010, pursuant to the Order Re Leave to File Action Without 17 Prepayment of Filing Fee by Magistrate Judge Ralph Zarefsky ("Order Re Leave to 18 File") [Doc. # 2], the complaint submitted by pro se plaintiff Alex P. Thorn, was 19 accepted for filing without prepayment of the filing fee. Thereafter, a copy of that 20 Order Re Leave to File was mailed to plaintiff at 71330 Highway 111, Rancho 21 Mirage, CA 92770, the address plaintiff provided to the court when he filed his 22 23 complaint. On February 16, 2010, the envelope containing the copy of the Order Re Leave to File was returned to the court undelivered from the United States 24 Postal Service with the notation, "Return to Sender – Not At This Address." 25 On February 8, 2010, an Order Returning Case for Reassignment 26 ("Reassignment Order") was issued, reassigning this case from Judge Ronald S.W. 27

28 Lew to Judge Dolly M. Gee. [Doc. # 7.] A copy of the Reassignment Order was

mailed to plaintiff at the same address. On March 8, 2010, the Reassignment Order
 was returned undelivered, with the same notation as that accompanying the
 undelivered order described above.

On February 16, 2010, the Initial Standing Order for Cases Assigned to
Judge Gee ("Initial Standing Order") was issued, a copy of which was mailed to
plaintiff at the same address. On April 29, 2010, the Initial Standing Order was
returned undelivered, with the notation, "Please send Back to Sender - No One By
that name at this address."

9 Pursuant to Local Rules 83-2.7 and 83-2.10.3, plaintiff was required to
10 notify the Clerk of Court of his address change within five (5) days and file a
11 notice of the address change in this action.

It is unclear to this court whether plaintiff intends to continue with this
action. His failure to file a notice of address change seems to indicate that plaintiff
no longer intends to prosecute this action. Before this court takes further steps to
have the complaint served upon the defendants, plaintiff should notify the court of
his intentions.

17 Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that by June 1, 2010, plaintiff shall show cause in writing why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. Plaintiff is advised that his failure to file a response to this order shall be deemed his consent to the dismissal of this action without prejudice for lack of prosecution. Plaintiff is further advised that his timely filing of a notice of his address change would be a sufficient response to this order.

24

25 Dated: May 19, 2010

- 26
- 27
- 28

Solly.

DOLLY M. GEE United States District Judge