1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	IGNATIUS ANYANWU, et al., No. CIV S-09-2493 GEB DAD PS
11	Plaintiffs,
12	V.
13	PROGRESSIVE FINANCIALFINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONSSERVICES, INC., et al.,FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
14 15	Defendants.
16	This matter came before the court on December 11, 2009 for a Status (Pretrial
17	Scheduling) Conference. Plaintiffs Ignatius Anyanwu and Ignatius Anyanwu, Jr., both
18	proceeding pro se in this action, made no appearance. June Dittus Coleman, Esq. appeared for
19	defendant Progressive Financial Services, Inc.
20	The docket reflects that plaintiffs did not file the Status Report required by the
21	court's October 6, 2009 Order Setting Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference. The docket
22	further reveals that plaintiffs have not filed any document in this action since the case was
23	removed from Sacramento County Superior Court on September 3, 2009. No document served
24	on plaintiffs by this court has been returned as undeliverable. Defendant's counsel stated on the
25	record at the Status Conference that she has had no contact with the plaintiffs other than serving
26	copies of documents on them.
	1

The court's October 6, 2009 order provides that "[e]ach party shall appear at the 1 2 Status Conference." (Order filed Oct. 6, 2009, at 2.) For the parties' convenience, the court 3 granted leave to appear telephonically by making arrangements no later than three days prior to 4 the Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference. (Id.) The order included the following admonition: 5 The pro se plaintiffs are informed that failure to file a timely status report or failure to appear at the status conference in person or telephonically may result in a recommendation that this case be 6 dismissed for lack of prosecution and as a sanction for failure to 7 comply with court orders and applicable rules. (Id. at 3 (citations omitted).) 8 9 In light of plaintiffs' failure to file a status report, failure to appear at the status 10 conference, and failure to take any steps to litigate their case, IT IS RECOMMENDED that this 11 action be dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution and as a sanction for failure to 12 comply with court orders and applicable rules. 13 These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States 14 District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1). Within 15 fourteen (14) days after the Clerk serves these findings and recommendations, any party may file, 16 and serve written objections to the findings and recommendations. A document containing 17 objections should be titled "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any reply to objections shall be filed within seven (7) days after the objections are served. The 18 19 parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may, under certain 20 circumstances, waive the right to appeal the district court's order. See Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 21 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). 22 DATED: December 14, 2009. 23 le A. Droget 24 DALE A DROZ 25 DAD:kw UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Ddad1\orders.prose\anyanwu2493.dlop.f&r 26

2