н

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	JERRY W. BAKER,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-10-1585 FCD KJM P
12	VS.
13	WAYNE WENHOLZ, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
15	/
16	By order filed June 30, 2010, plaintiff's complaint was dismissed and thirty days'
17	leave to file an amended complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis was granted.
18	The thirty day period has now expired, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint, an
19	application to proceed in forma pauperis or otherwise responded to the court's June 30, 2010
20	order.
21	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed
22	without prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).
23	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District
24	Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within twenty-
25	one days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written
26	objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's
	1

1	Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff 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: August 16, 2010.
5 6	U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
7	1
8	bak1585.fta
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2

I