

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  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEANLOUISE HALLAL and BRENT ALAN  
BRIGNER,

Plaintiffs,

v.

EABAL QTIK, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:21-cv-00525-NONE-SKO

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATION

(Doc. No. 4)

On March 26, 2021, plaintiffs JeanLouise Hallal and Brent Alan Brigner, proceeding *pro se*, filed the complaint in this case against defendants. (Doc. No. 1.) On March 31, 2021, the court directed plaintiffs to either pay the \$402 filing fee or submit applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* pursuant to Title 28 of the United States Code section 1915, within 30 days of the date of service of the order, as plaintiffs had done neither at the time of the filing of the complaint. (Doc. No. 2.) When served at plaintiffs' address of record, the March 31, 2021 order was returned as undeliverable on April 21, 2021. (*See* Docket.) Local Rule 183(b) provides that:

A party appearing in propria persona shall keep the Court and opposing parties advised as to his or her current address. If mail directed to a plaintiff in propria persona by the Clerk is returned by the U.S. Postal Service, and if such plaintiff fails to notify the Court and opposing parties within sixty-three (63) days thereafter of a current address, the Court may dismiss the action without prejudice for failure to prosecute.

E.D. Cal. L.R. 183(b). Although more than 63 days have passed since the U.S. Postal Service

1 returned the court's March 31, 2021 order as undeliverable, plaintiffs have failed to notify the  
2 court of their current address(es).

3 On July 1, 2021, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommended that the  
4 case be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute this action. (Doc. No. 4.) Plaintiffs  
5 were granted twenty-one (21) days in which to file objections to the findings and recommendation.  
6 (*Id.*) No objections have been filed, and the time do so has expired.

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 the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds that the  
9 findings and recommendation are supported by the record and proper analysis.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 11 1. The findings and recommendation issued July 1, 2021 (Doc. No. 4) are adopted in full;
- 12 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice based on plaintiffs' failure to prosecute this  
13 action; and
- 14 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

15

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17

18 Dated: August 5, 2021

19

20

21

22

23


24

25

26

27

28

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE