

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

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERTO R. RECINO,)	1:15-cv-00362-LJO-BAM (PC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
)	REGARDING DISMISSAL OF ACTION
v.)	FOR FAILURE TO OBEY A COURT
)	ORDER AND FAILURE TO STATE A
UNKNOWN,)	CLAIM
)	
Defendant.)	(ECF Nos. 14, 18)
)	
)	
)	FOURTEEN-DAY DEADLINE
)	

Plaintiff Roberto R. Recino (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On May 5, 2015, the Court dismissed Plaintiff’s complaint with leave to amend within thirty days. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Plaintiff was warned that if he failed to file an amended complaint in compliance with the order, this action would be dismissed for failure to obey a court order and failure to state a claim. Plaintiff’s amended complaint was due on or before June 8, 2015. (ECF No. 11.) On June 11, 2015, the Court granted Plaintiff a fifteen-day extension of time to file his amended complaint. (ECF No. 18.) The deadline for Plaintiff to file his amended complaint has passed and Plaintiff has not complied with the Court’s order or otherwise contacted the Court. As a result, there is no pleading on file which sets forth any claims upon which relief may be granted.

1 Accordingly, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), IT IS HEREBY
2 RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed based on Plaintiff's failure to obey a court order
3 and failure to state a claim.

4 These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District
5 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within
6 **fourteen (14) days** after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may
7 file written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to
8 Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file
9 objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of the "right to challenge the
10 magistrate's factual findings" on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir.
11 2014) (citing Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

12
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: July 2, 2015

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE