

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

ESMOND HEDRINGTON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-2615 GEB KJM P

vs.

DEPUTY KENDRICKS, et al.,

Defendants.

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_/

By order filed November 3, 2008, plaintiff’s complaint was dismissed and thirty days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. The thirty day period has now expired, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court’s order.

Although it appears from the file that plaintiff’s copy of the order was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff’s responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 83-182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See Local Rule 11-110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

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

1 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written  
2 objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's  
3 Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the  
4 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951  
5 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

6 DATED: January 16, 2009.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 1  
10 hedr2516.fta

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26