

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 ANDRE LAMAR JAMES,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 RILEY and GUTIERREZ,

15 Defendants.  
16

Case No. 1:22-cv-00625-HBK (PC)

ORDER TO ASSIGN A DISTRICT JUDGE

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO  
DISMISS ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE  
PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 182(b)<sup>1</sup>

14-DAY DEADLINE

17 Plaintiff Andre Lamar James is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights  
18 action. For the reasons set forth below, the undersigned recommends that the District Court  
19 dismiss this action consistent with the Court's Local Rule for Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this  
20 action. Specifically, Plaintiff failed to keep the Court apprised of a current address.  
21

22 **BACKGROUND**

23 Plaintiff initiated this action by filing a civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.  
24 (Doc. No. 1, "Complaint"). On August 21, 2023, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A the Court issued  
25 a screening order. (Doc. No. 11 at 1). The Court afforded Plaintiff three options to exercise by  
26 September 21, 2023: (1) file an amended complaint; (2) file a notice that he intends to stand on

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>1</sup> This matter was referred to the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302  
(E.D. Cal. 2022).

1 his initial complaint subject to the undersigned recommending the district court dismiss certain  
2 claims and Defendants; or (3) stand on his Complaint subject to the undersigned recommending  
3 the district court dismiss certain claims and Defendants. (*Id.* at 9-10). The Court expressly  
4 warned Plaintiff that if he “fails to timely respond to this Court Order or seek an extension of time  
5 to comply” the undersigned “will recommend that the district court dismiss this case as a sanction  
6 for Plaintiff’s failure to comply with a court order and prosecute this action.” (*Id.* at 10 ¶ 2). On  
7 August 31, 2023, the August 21, 2023 Screening Order was returned undeliverable. (*See* docket).  
8 Per Local Rule 183(b) Plaintiff was required to update his address with the Court within 63 days  
9 of the mail being returned undeliverable. (E.D. Cal. 2022). As of the date of this Findings and  
10 Recommendation, Plaintiff has not filed an updated address as required by Local Rule 182(f) and  
11 the time to do so has expired. *See* docket.

#### 12 **APPLICABLE LAW AND ANALYSIS**

13 Plaintiff was obligated to keep this Court informed of his proper address. Specifically:

14 [a] party appearing *in propria persona* shall keep the Court and  
15 opposing parties advised as to his or her current address. If mail  
16 directed to a plaintiff *in propria persona* by the Clerk is returned by  
17 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.

18 Local Rule 183(b); *see also* Local Rule 182(f) (all parties are “under a continuing duty” to notify  
19 the clerk of “any change of address[.]”). Plaintiff was notified of his obligation to keep the Court  
20 informed of his address and advised that the Court would dismiss an action without prejudice if  
21 Plaintiff does not update his address within sixty-three (63) days. (Doc. No. 3, VIII.B.).  
22 Precedent supports a dismissal of a case when a litigant does not keep the court apprised on his  
23 address. *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming lower court and finding no  
24 abuse of discretion when district court dismissed case without prejudice after pro se plaintiff did  
25 not comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs keep court apprised of addresses at all  
26 times); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal proper for failure to  
27 prosecute and comply with local rules of court); *Hanley v. Opinski*, 2018 WL 3388510 (E.D. Ca.  
28 July 10, 2018) (dismissing action for failure to prosecute and to provide court with current

1 address); *Davis v. Kern Valley State Prison*, 2023 WL 2992980, at \*1, fn 1 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 18,  
2 2023). More than sixty-three (63) days has passed since the Court's August 21, 2023 Order was  
3 returned as undeliverable, and Plaintiff has not filed a notice of change of address.

4 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

5 The Clerk of Court is directed to assign a district judge to this case.


6 It is further **RECOMMENDED**:

7 This action be **DISMISSED** without prejudice for pursuant to Local Rule 183(b) for  
8 Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this action.

9 **NOTICE**

10 These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District  
11 Judge assigned to this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 14 days  
12 of the date of service of these Findings and Recommendations, a party may file written objections  
13 with the Court. The document should be captioned, "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings  
14 and Recommendations." A party's failure to file objections within the specified time may result in  
15 waiver of his rights on appeal. *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing  
16 *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

17  
18 Dated: November 9, 2023

19   
20 HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA  
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28