

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

IKEEM JARMER HUDSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
J. VASQUEZCOY, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:21-cv-01060-JLT (PC)

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
TO DISMISS ACTION FOR FAILURE TO
PROSECUTE**

14-DAY DEADLINE

Clerk of Court to assign a district judge.

On August 31, 2021, the Court issued an order granting Plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). (Doc. 7.) The Court served the IFP order on Plaintiff by U.S. Postal Service. On September 22, 2021, the U.S. Postal Service returned the order as undeliverable. To date, Plaintiff has not updated his address with the Court or responded to the IFP order.

As explained in the Court’s first informational order, a party appearing *pro se* must keep the Court advised of his current address. (Doc. 2 at 5.) Pursuant to the Local Rules, if mail directed to a *pro se* plaintiff at his address of record is returned by the U.S. Postal Service and the plaintiff fails to update his address within 63 days, the Court may dismiss his action for failure to prosecute. E.D. Cal. R. 183(b).

The Local Rules also provide that the “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” E.D. Cal. R. 110. “District courts have

