1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CHARLES L. DAVIS,	No. 1:19-cv-01142-DAD-EPG (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING
14	DEPARTMENT OF ADULT PAROLE OPPERATIONS HANFORD,	ACTION DUE TO PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND OBEY COURT
15	Defendants.	ORDERS
16		(Doc. No. 28)
17		
18	Plaintiff Charles L. Davis ¹ is proceeding <i>pro se</i> and <i>in forma pauperis</i> in this civil rights	
19	action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States	
20	Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
21	On June 9, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations	
22	recommending that this action be dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to obey court orders and	
23	failure to prosecute this case. (Doc. No. 28.) Specifically, plaintiff failed to appear on May 13,	
24	2020 at the mandatory Initial Scheduling Conference as required by the court's order setting the	
25	conference (Doc. No. 21), and plaintiff failed to respond to the court's order to show cause "why	
26	he should not be sanctioned up to and including dismissal of this action for failing to appear at the	
2728	Plaintiff Davis was a state prisoner at the time he filed his complaint, but his address of record indicates that he is no longer incarcerated. (<i>See</i> Doc. No. 28 at 1, n.1.)	

1 Initial Scheduling Conference, for failing to file a scheduling conference statement, and for 2 failing to make initial disclosures," (Doc. No. 26). (Doc. No. 28 at 1–2.) Those pending findings 3 and recommendations were served on plaintiff by mail at his address of record on June 9, 2020 4 and contained notice that objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days of service of the findings and recommendations. (Id. at 4.) To date, no objections to the pending findings 5 6 and recommendations have been filed, and the time in which to do so has now passed. 7 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a 8 de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that 9 the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. 10 Accordingly, 11 1. The findings and recommendations issued on June 9, 2020 (Doc No. 28) are 12 adopted in full; 2. 13 This action is dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to obey court orders and failure to 14 prosecute; and 15 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case. 16 IT IS SO ORDERED. 17 Dated: **October 13, 2020** 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28