

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

RALPH VERNON WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

DELANO REGIONAL MEDICAL
CENTER, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:20-cv-01563-NONE-SKO (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS IN PART AND
DISMISSING ACTION

(Doc. No. 14)

Plaintiff Ralph Vernon Williams is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On August 10, 2021, the assigned magistrate judge filed a screening order, finding that plaintiff’s complaint fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted. (Doc. No. 11.) The magistrate judge directed plaintiff to file an amended complaint within 21 days. (*Id.* at 5.) Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint or to otherwise respond to the screening order.

Therefore, on September 14, 2021, the magistrate judge issued an order to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for failure to obey court orders. (Doc. No. 12.) The magistrate judge cautioned plaintiff that “[f]ailure to comply with this order w[ould] result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed for failure to state a claim and to obey court

1 orders.” (*Id.* at 2.) Plaintiff failed to respond to the order to show cause.

2 Accordingly, on October 27, 2021, the magistrate judge filed findings and
3 recommendations, recommending that this action be dismissed for plaintiff’s failure to state a
4 claim and failure to obey court orders. (Doc. No. 14.) The findings and recommendations were
5 served on plaintiff and provided him fourteen days to file objections thereto. (*Id.* at 2.) Plaintiff
6 has not filed any objections, and the time do so has passed.


7 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a
8 *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court adopts the
9 findings and recommendations in part insofar as they recommend dismissal for failure to obey a
10 court order. The court declines to address the remaining ground(s) upon which dismissal is
11 recommended.

12 Accordingly,

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations issued on October 27, 2021 (Doc. No. 14) are
14 adopted insofar as they recommend dismissal for failure to obey court orders;
- 15 2. This action is dismissed for plaintiff’s failure to obey court orders; and,
- 16 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to assign a district judge to this case for
17 purposes of closure and to close this case.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19
20 Dated: November 30, 2021



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE