

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

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CHARLES NEUMANN,
Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-07-0082-DFL-CMK-P

vs.

ORDER

MARTIN VEAL, et al.,
Defendants.

_____ /

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court is Defendant’s motion to compel responses and for sanctions (Doc. 61). Plaintiff has not responded to this pending motion.

It appears from the motion that Plaintiff has been paroled, and has not informed either the court nor Defendants of his current address. Local Rule 83-182(f) requires attorneys and parties proceeding pro se to keep the court and all other parties apprised of any change of address or telephone number. It also provides that “[a]bsent such notice, service of documents at the prior address of the attorney or party shall be fully effective.” Local Rule 83-182(f). Plaintiff was previously informed of this requirement by court order. (See Doc. 21).

///

1 Plaintiff is therefore required to show cause in writing, within 30 days of the date
2 of service of this order, why this case should not be dismissed for failure to keep the court
3 informed of his current address. See Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (per
4 curiam).

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6
7 DATED: August 18, 2009

8 
9 **CRAIG M. KELLISON**
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26