

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

DOUGLAS ANDERSEN,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-09-2626 DAD P

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Respondent.

ORDER AND

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Recent court documents were served on petitioner’s address of record and returned by the postal service. 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 ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is directed to randomly assign this case to a U.S. District Judge.

Also, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed due to 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

1 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file written  
2 objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's  
3 Findings and Recommendations." Petitioner 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: October 26, 2009.

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

10 DAD:4  
11 ande2626.133

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