

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. 5:22-cv-01636-SPG-SHK

Date: January 18, 2023

Title: *Rodney Adams v. Riverside County Larry D. Smith Correctional Facility, et al.*

Present: The Honorable Shashi H. Kewalramani, United States Magistrate Judge

D. Castellanos  
Deputy Clerk

Not Reported  
Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):

None Present

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):

None Present

**Proceedings: ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

On December 15, 2022, the Court issued its Order Dismissing Second Amended Complaint (“SAC”) with Leave to Amend (“ODLA”) and provided Plaintiff with a blank Civil Rights Form and a Voluntarily Dismissal form with the ODLA. Electronic Case Filing (“ECF No.”) 11, ODLA. Plaintiff’s Third Amended Complaint (“TAC”) was due by January 5, 2023. See id. at 12 (ordering Plaintiff to file a TAC within twenty-one days of the ODLA issuing).

To date, Plaintiff has not filed a TAC or otherwise participated in this litigation. The Court notes, however, that the ODLA—which was sent to Plaintiff’s address of record at the Larry D. Smith Correctional Facility (“LDSCF”) in Banning, California—was returned to the Court by the United States Postal Service (“USPS”) with a notation that the ODLA was “Not Deliverable As Addressed; Unable to Forward.” ECF No. 12, Returned Mail. Further, the Court’s review of the Riverside County Sheriff’s inmate locator website indicates that Plaintiff was released on November 16, 2022.

Local Rule of Civil Procedure for the United States District Court for the Central District of California (“Local Rule”) 41-6 requires pro se parties to keep the Court and opposing parties apprised of their current address and telephone number, if any, and e-mail address, if any. If mail directed by the Clerk of Court to a pro se plaintiff’s address of record is returned undelivered by the USPS, and if, within fourteen days of the service date, such plaintiff fails to notify, in writing, the Court and opposing parties of plaintiff’s current address, the Court may dismiss the action with or without prejudice for want of prosecution.

Here, it appears that Plaintiff has been released from LDSCF and has failed to inform the Court of his updated address in violation of Local Rule 41-6, and that Plaintiff may have abandoned this litigation. Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE by **January 30, 2023**, why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute, follow Court orders, and comply with the Local Rules. Plaintiff can satisfy this Order by updating the Court with his current address **and** either: (1) filing a TAC; (2) indicating in writing that he wishes to stand on the claims raised in his SAC; or (3) voluntarily dismissing this action by the date listed above.

**Plaintiff is warned that failure to timely perform any of the above options will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed for failure to prosecute and follow Court orders.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**