IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VINCENT SCOTT MARCONETT,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-09-3369 JAM EFB P

VS.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On December 23, 2009, the court found that plaintiff's affidavit in support of his application to proceed *in forma pauperis* was incomplete and that had has not submitted a certified copy of his trust account statement or the institutional equivalent. Accordingly, the court ordered plaintiff to submit the required trust account statement and a completed affidavit within thirty days and warned him that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed.

The 30-day period has expired and plaintiff has not filed the required trust account statement or completed affidavit, nor otherwise responded to the court's order.¹

¹ Although it appears from the docket that plaintiff's copy of the order was served upon him three times and returned marked "undeliverable," plaintiff was properly served. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

Accordingly, it is RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice.

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)(l). Within fourteen 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 "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. *Turner v*. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

Dated: March 4, 2010.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE