

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

ORLANDO MADUENO,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-1850 GGH P

vs.

GARY STANTON, et al.,

Defendants.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_ /

By an order filed August 3, 2010, plaintiff was ordered to file an affidavit in support of his request to proceed in forma pauperis or pay the appropriate filing fee within twenty-eight days and was cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. The twenty-eight day period has now expired, and plaintiff has not responded to the court’s order and has not filed an affidavit or paid the appropriate filing fee. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. The Clerk of Court is directed to assign a district judge to this case.

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, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned

1 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Any reply to the objections  
2 shall be served and filed within fourteen days after service of the objections. The parties are  
3 advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the  
4 District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

5 DATED: September 30, 2010

6  
7 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows

8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 /madu1850.fifp  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26