1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	EDUARDO DACUMOS,
11	Plaintiff, No. 2:10-cv-00854 FCD KJN PS
12	V.
13	WORLD SAVINGS BANK,
14	Defendant. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
16	Plaintiff, who is proceeding without counsel and has not paid the fee ordinarily
17	required to file an action in this court, previously filed an incomplete application to proceed in
18	forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). (See Dkt. No. 2). Because the incomplete
19	application prevented the court from properly evaluating whether plaintiff should be granted
20	leave to proceed in forma pauperis, the undersigned granted plaintiff twenty-one days within
21	which to either: (1) file a completed application to proceed in forma pauperis, or (2) file the
22	appropriate initial filing fee of \$350.00. (Dkt. No. 3.) Plaintiff did not submit a completed
23	application or the appropriate initial filing fee. As a result, the undersigned entered proposed
24	findings and recommendations that recommended the denial of plaintiff's application to proceed
25	in forma pauperis, and that plaintiff be provided twenty-one days within which to pay the
26	appropriate initial filing fee. (Dkt. No. 4.)
	1

1

1 On June 28, 2010, plaintiff filed: (1) objections to the proposed findings and 2 recommendations, and (2) a second application to proceed in forma pauperis. (Dkt. Nos. 5, 6.) 3 Plaintiff's objections explain that, due to certain physical limitations including partial paralysis and significant visual impairment, he relies on others to check and retrieve his mail and that 4 5 correspondence from the court regarding his incomplete application to proceed in forma pauperis 6 "was inadvertently overlooked and was not given to the plaintiff in time." (Dkt. No. 6 at 2.) 7 The undersigned concludes the reasons provided by plaintiff support vacating the previously filed findings and recommendations. Plaintiff is informed, however, that future 8 9 failures to comply with court orders, the court's local rules, or the rules of civil procedure may 10 result in the dismissal of his case. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Local Rules 110, 183(a); see Hells 11 Canyon Preservation Council v. U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005) (recognizing that courts may dismiss an action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) 12 13 sua sponte for a plaintiff's failure to prosecute or comply with the rules of civil procedure or the court's orders); Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam) ("Failure to follow 14 15 a district court's local rules is a proper ground for dismissal."); King v. Atiyeh, 814 F.2d 565, 16 567 (9th Cir. 1987) ("Pro se litigants must follow the same rules of procedure that govern other 17 litigants."). 18 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 19 1. The previously filed findings and recommendations are vacated (Dkt. 20 No. 4). //// 21 22 //// 23 //// 24 //// 25 //// 26 |||| 2

1	2. The undersigned will resolve plaintiff's second application to proceed in
2	forma pauperis, and screen plaintiff's complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), by separate
3	order and/or findings and recommendations.
4	IT IS SO ORDERED.
5	DATED: June 28, 2010
6	
7	
8	KENDALL J. NEWMAN
9	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15 16	
16 17	
17	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	3