

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

STEVEN D. LEWIS,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-09-1536 MCE GGH PS

vs.

BILL SCHAUFLER, et al.,

Defendants.

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

_____ /

By order filed September 15, 2009, plaintiff’s complaint was dismissed and thirty days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. In that order, the court informed plaintiff of the deficiencies in his complaint. On November 13, 2009, plaintiff was granted a twenty-eight day extension of time to file his amended complaint. The twenty-eight day period has now expired, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court’s order.

Plaintiff has apparently decided to rest on the dismissed complaint. For the reasons given in the September 15, 2009, order, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed with 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 fourteen

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 15, 2010

/s/ Gregory G. Hollows

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 lewis1536.fta

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26