1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	MICHAEL HUGHLEY,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-10-1373 GEB GGH P
12	VS.
13	JOHN W. HAVILAND, Warden, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
15	/
16	By order filed August 13, 2010, the court re-designated this action as one brought
17	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and granted plaintiff twenty-eight days to file a fully completed in
18	forma pauperis application and an amended complaint. The twenty-eight day period has now
19	expired, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's
20	order.
21	For the reasons given in the August 13, 2010, order, IT IS HEREBY
22	RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed with prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R.
23	Civ. P. 41(b). The Clerk of Court is directed to assign a district judge to this case.
24	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District
25	Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within
26	fourteen (14) days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file
	1

1	written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate
2	Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any response to the objections shall be filed and
3	served within fourteen days after service of the objections. Plaintiff is advised that failure to file
4	objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order.
5	DATED: October 21, 2010
6	
7	/s/ Gregory G. Hollows
8	GREGORY G. HOLLOWS UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9	GGH:035 hugh1373.fff
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2

I