1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 STANLEY E. REDICK, III, No. 1:21-cv-00287-NONE-SAB 12 Plaintiff, ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING TION, AND DIRECTING THE CLERK 13 v. <u>OF THE COURT TO ASSIGN THIS</u> 14 SONORA POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al., MATTER TO A DISTRICT JUDGE AND CLOSE THE CASE 15 Defendants. (Doc. Nos. 11, 13, 14) 16 17 Plaintiff Stanley E. Redick, III, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this action 18 on March 1, 2021, alleging various claims against the Sonora Police Department and its officers, 19 20 the Tuolumne County Jail and its office, and the Tuolumne District Attorney Office and its attorneys. (Doc. No. 1.) The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 21 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 22 On August 10, 2021, the assigned magistrate judge issued a screening order granting 23 plaintiff the opportunity to file a third amended complaint. (Doc. No. 13.) Plaintiff was granted 24 thirty (30) days to file the third amended complaint but failed to do so. On October 12, 2021, the 25 assigned magistrate judge therefore issued findings and recommendations, recommending that 26

plaintiff's second amended complaint be dismissed for failure to state a claim, for failure to

comply with a court order, and failure to prosecute. (Doc. No. 14.) The findings and

27

28

recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections to the 2 findings and recommendations were to be filed within thirty days from the date of service. (*Id.*) 3 The period for filing objections has passed and no objections have been filed. 4 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a 5 de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court agrees with the findings and recommendations that plaintiff has failed to state any valid claims. Plaintiff was 6 7 afforded an opportunity to amend his complaint but has not filed a third amended complaint. 8 Therefore, dismissal is also warranted due to plaintiff's failure to obey a court order and failure 9 to prosecute this action. Accordingly, 10 11 1. The findings and recommendations, filed October 12, 2021 (Doc. No. 14), are 12 adopted in full; Plaintiff's second amended complaint, filed May 26, 2021 (Doc. No. 11), is 2. 13 14 dismissed for failure to state a claim, for failure to comply with a court order, and 15 failure to prosecute; and 3. 16 The Clerk of the Court is directed to randomly assign this matter to a district 17 judge and close the case. 18 IT IS SO ORDERED. 19

Dated: **December 15, 2021**

22

21

20

1

23

24

25 26

27

28