| 1 | | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | UNITED STA | ATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 7 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | LARRY ALTAMIRANO SERMENO, | Case No. 1:17-cv-00036-AWI-JLT (PC) |
| 10 | Plaintiff, | ORDER CLOSING CASE DUE TO |
| 11 | V. | VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND DENYING MOTIONS AND |
| 12 | MONTEREY COUNTY SUPERIOR | FINDINGS AND RECOMMEDNATION AS MOOT |
| 13 | COURT, et al., | (Doc. 26) |
| 14 | Defendants. | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | Plaintiff, Larry Altamirano Serm | eno, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma |
| 17 | pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 31, 2017, Plaintiff | |
| 18 | filed a request for dismissal of this action. (Doc. 26) Although not stated in Plaintiff's request, ¹ | |
| 19 | the Court construes it as one made pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(i). | |
| 20 | In Wilson v. City of San Jose, the Ninth Circuit explained: | |
| 21 | Under Rule 41(a)(1), a plaintiff has an absolute right to voluntarily dismiss his action prior to service by the defendant of an answer or a motion for summary judgment. <i>Concha v. London</i> , 62 F.3d 1493, 1506 (9th Cir. 1995) (citing <i>Hamilton v. Shearson-Lehman American Express</i> , 813 F.2d 1532, 1534 (9th Cir. 1987)). A plaintiff may dismiss his action so long as the plaintiff files a notice of dismissal prior to the defendant's service of an answer or motion for summary judgment. The dismissal is effective on filing and no court order is required. <i>Id.</i> The plaintiff may dismiss some or all of the defendants, or some or all of his claims, through a Rule 41(a)(1) notice. <i>Id.</i> ; <i>Pedrina v. Chun</i> , 987 F.2d 608, 609-10 (9th Cir. 1993). The filing of a notice of voluntary dismissal | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | ¹ Plaintiff's notice states "I would like to reques | t for (sic) a voluntary dismissal until further notice (sic) thank you |

and God bless." (Doc. 26.)

| 1 | commence another action for the same cause against the same defendants. <i>Id.</i> (citing <i>McKenzie v. Davenport-Harris Funeral Home</i> , 834 F.2d 930, 934-35 (9th Cir. 1987)). Such a dismissal leaves the parties as though no action had been brought. <i>Id.</i> | |
|----------|--|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 5 | | |
| 6 | Wilson v. City of San Jose, 111 F.3d 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1997). | |
| 7 | Neither answers to Plaintiff's Complaint, nor motions for summary judgment have been | |
| 8 | filed in this case; nor have any such answers or summary judgment motions been served since | |
| 9 | Plaintiff has not stated a cognizable claim for his pleading to be served on any of the defendants. | |
| 10 | Because Plaintiff has exercised his right to voluntarily dismiss the complaint under Rule 41(a)(1), | |
| 10 | this case has terminated. See Wilson, 111 F.3d at 692. | |
| 11 | Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: | |
| 12 | 1. The Clerk is ordered to CLOSE this case in light of Plaintiff's Rule 41(a)(1)(i) requested | |
| 13 | dismissal without prejudice; | |
| 14 | 2. Plaintiff's motions to stay (Doc. Nos. 9, 25) is DENIED as moot; and | |
| 15 | 3. The Findings and Recommendation issued on May 26, 2017 (Doc. No. 24) are denied as | |
| 10 | moot. | |
| 17 | | |
| 10 19 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 19 20 | Dated: August 2, 2017 | |
| 20 21 | SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE | |
| 21 22 | | |
| 22 | | |
| | | |
| 24 25 | | |
| 25 26 | | |
| 26 27 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |