

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

JOHN MARVIN BALLARD,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-07-2527 LKK DAD P

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_ /

A recent court order denying petitioner’s motion for reconsideration was served on petitioner’s address of record and returned by the postal service as “undeliverable, no longer in custody.” It appears that petitioner has failed to comply with Local Rule 83-182(f), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for petitioner's failure to keep the court apprised of his current address. See Local Rules 83-182(f) and 11-110 (E.D. Cal. 1997).

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned

1 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Any reply to the objections  
2 shall be served and filed within ten days after service of the objections. The parties are advised  
3 that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District  
4 Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

5 DATED: July 27, 2009.

6  
7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 DALE A. DROZD  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 DAD:kly/4  
10 ball2527.133a