1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 RICHARD A. MATLOCK, CASE NO. 1:19-cv-1368 NONE JLT (PC) Plaintiff, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 12 SMISS FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT ORDER AND FAILURE TO 13 v. **PROSECUTE** 14 KERN COUNTY, et al., FOURTEEN-DAY DEADLINE 15 Defendants. 16 By order filed December 7, 2020, the Court granted plaintiff an extension of time to file a 17 response to the court's screening order. The 45-day period has now passed, and plaintiff has not 18 filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. Accordingly, the court 19 RECOMMENDS that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to comply with a 20 court order and failure to prosecute. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). 21 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge 22 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days 23 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections 24 with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections 25 to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file 26 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. 27

28

1	Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
2	W VG GO OPP FINE
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	Dated: March 2, 2021 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	