

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

FERNANDO VALENZUELA,

Petitioner,

No.2:10-cv-0973-JFM (HC)

vs.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA,

Respondent.

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

By order filed May 7, 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 randomly assign a district judge to this matter; and

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 fourteen 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.” Any response to the objections shall be filed and served
2 within fourteen days after service of the objections. Petitioner is advised that failure to file
3 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order.
4 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

5 DATED: August 9, 2010.

6
7 
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 /014;vale0973.fta.hab

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