UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BRYAN D. DENTON, Case No.: 1:13-cv-00017-AWI-BAM PC ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO FILE Plaintiff, NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS OR SHOW v. CAUSE WHY THIS ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE PULIDO, et al., (ECF No. 33) Defendants. THIRTY-DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff Bryan D. Denton ("Plaintiff") is a former county jail inmate proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff initiated this action on January 4, 2013. Defendant Pulido filed an answer on April 25, 2014, and discovery opened in this matter on April 29, 2014.

On September 26, 2014, the Court received notice that Plaintiff is no longer in custody at the Sacramento County Main Jail. (ECF No. 33.) Plaintiff has not provided the Court with his current address.

Pursuant to Local Rules 182 and 183, a pro se party is under a continuing duty to notify the Clerk, the Court and all other parties of any change of address or telephone number. Local Rule 182(f), 183(b). Additionally, Local Rule 110 provides that "[f]ailure . . . of a party to comply with these [Local] Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any

and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court." Further, the failure of Plaintiff to prosecute this action is grounds for dismissal. <u>In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability</u> Litigation, 460 F.3d 1217 (9th Cir. 2006). Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that within thirty (30) days from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall either: (1) file a notice informing the Court and defendant of his current address; or show cause in writing why this action should not be dismissed for failure to (2) prosecute. The failure to respond to this order will result in dismissal of this action without prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Dated: September 30, 2014