

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

HUNG DUONG NGUON,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-10-0704 DAD P

vs.

JAMES WALKER,

Respondent.

ORDER AND

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_ /

By order filed May 3, 2010, petitioner’s application was dismissed and thirty days’ leave to file an amended application was granted. The thirty day period has now expired, and petitioner has not filed an amended application or otherwise responded to the court’s order.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is directed to randomly assign this case to a District Judge.

Also, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See Local Rule 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-one days after being served with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s

1 Findings and Recommendations.” Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the  
2 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951  
3 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

4 DATED: June 22, 2010.

5  
6   
7 \_\_\_\_\_  
8 DALE A. DROZD  
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 DAD:4  
9 ngon704.fta

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