

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  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAYMOND C. WATKINS,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
TUOLUMNE COUNTY and GUARDS,  
Defendants.

No. 1:18-cv-00787-DAD-JDP (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING  
ACTION FOR FAILURE TO STATE A  
CLAIM, TO PROSECUTE, AND TO  
FOLLOW A COURT ORDER

(Doc. No. 10)

Plaintiff Raymond C. Watkins is a pretrial detainee proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On October 30, 2019, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending that the case be dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to state a claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with a court order. (Doc. No. 10.) The findings and recommendation were served on both parties and contained notice that any objections thereto

/////  
/////  
/////

1 were to be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service.<sup>1</sup> (*Id.* at 2.) No objections have  
2 been filed and the time in which to do so has now passed.

3 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a  
4 *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that  
5 the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

6 Accordingly:

- 7 1. The findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 10) issued on October 30, 2019 are  
8 adopted in full;
- 9 2. This action is dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to state a claim, failure to  
10 prosecute, and failure to obey a court order; and
- 11 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

12  
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: March 30, 2020

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> The pending findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff but returned to the court as undeliverable. Plaintiff has not filed a notice of change of address with the court. Plaintiff, as a *pro se* party “is responsible for keeping the Court informed of his current address; absent filing a notice of change of address, service at the prior address is fully effective. *Pogue v. Hedgpeth*, No. 1:11-CV-00192-LJO, 2014 WL 1271379, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2014) (citing Local Rule 182(f)).