1	
2	
3	
4	
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7	GREGORY RODRIGUEZ, CASE NO. 1:09-cv-02184-AWI-SKO PC
8	Plaintiff, ORDER (1) REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO PAY
9	v. DEFENDANT \$630.00 IN INCURRED EXPENSES, (2) ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
10	HOPKINS, RECOMMENDATIONS IN FULL, AND (3) DISMISSING THE ACTION, WITH
11	PREJUDICE, FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE Defendant.
12	(Docs. 32 and 33)
13	
14	Plaintiff Gregory Rodriguez, a former state prisoner proceeding prose and in forma pauperis,
15	filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on December 16, 2009. This action is
16	proceeding against Defendant Hopkins for use of excessive physical force, in violation of the Eighth
17	Amendment.
18	This action was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
19	636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On January 30, 2013, the Magistrate Judge issued a Findings and
20	Recommendations recommending dismissal of this action based on Plaintiff's failure to prosecute.
21	Objections were due within fifteen days, but neither party objected. <sup>1</sup>
22	In addition, the Magistrate Judge issued an order granting Defendant's motion to compel
23	responses to discovery requests and requiring Plaintiff to show cause within fifteen days why he
24	should not be ordered to pay the reasonable expenses incurred by Defendant in bringing the motion
25	to compel. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5). Plaintiff did not file a response.
26	
27	<sup>1</sup> The United States Postal Service recently returned several court documents as undeliverable. Notations

The United States Postal Service recently returned several court documents as undeliverable. Notations
on the envelopes state "Attempted - Not Known." However, Plaintiff has not notified the Court of any change in his address. Absent such notice, service at a party's prior address is fully effective. Local Rule 182(f).

In seeking reasonable expenses, Defendant's counsel attested that Defendant incurred
attorney's fees in the amount of \$630.00 in preparing the motion to compel. (Doc. 29-1, Coleman
Dec., ¶10.) Counsel estimated that with a reply brief and a hearing, the fees would amount to
\$1,050.00. (*Id.*) Defendant did not file a reply brief, as Plaintiff did not oppose the motion to
compel, and there was no hearing on the matter. Local Rule 230(1). Therefore, Defendant is entitled
to \$630.00. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5).

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

 Plaintiff is required to pay Defendant, in care of Defendant's counsel, \$630.00, which reflects the attorney's fees incurred in bringing the motion to compel;

2. The Findings and Recommendations, filed on January 30, 2013, is adopted in full;

3. This action is dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to prosecute; and

4. The Clerk's Office shall enter judgment against Plaintiff.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 26, 2013

Ashlin

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE