

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

CHRISTIAN DAVID ENTO,
Plaintiff,
v.
WASHINGTON, D.C., et al.,
Defendants.

No. 1:21-cv-01537-DAD-HBK

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

(Doc. No. 4)

Plaintiff Christian David Ento is proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 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 October 18, 2021, plaintiff filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Doc. No. 2.) Finding that plaintiff’s motion was incomplete and unsigned, the assigned magistrate judge issued an order denying plaintiff’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and directing plaintiff to file a complete and signed *in forma pauperis* application within twenty-one (21) days of service. (Doc. No. 6.) That order was served on plaintiff at his address of record. On November 4, 2021, the assigned magistrate judge’s order was returned to the court as “Undeliverable, Return to Sender, Insufficient Address, Unable to Forward.” Plaintiff did not file an updated address with the court as is required by Local Rule 182(f) and Local Rule 183(b). On January 18, 2022, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending that plaintiff’s case be

1 dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to update his address and his failure to prosecute. (Doc. No.
2 4.) Those findings and recommendations were again served by mail on plaintiff at his address of
3 record and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days
4 of service. (*Id.*) The findings and recommendations were, not unexpectedly, once again returned
5 to the court as undeliverable. Plaintiff has not filed any objections with this court and the time in
6 which to do so has since passed. Plaintiff was required by Local Rule 183 to file a notice of
7 change of address with this court within sixty-three (63) days of the first undeliverable notice and
8 has not done so.

9 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a
10 *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings
11 and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

12 Accordingly,

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations issued on January 18, 2022 (Doc. No. 4) are
14 adopted;
- 15 2. This action is dismissed, without prejudice, due to plaintiff's failure to prosecute
16 and failure to keep the court apprised of his current mailing address as required;
17 and
- 18 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: June 6, 2022

21 
22 _____
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28