The thirty-day deadline has expired, and plaintiff has not responded to the court's order, although plaintiff has filed a consent to the jurisdiction of the magistrate judge (Dkt. No. 5), and two barely-legible matters, a "Notice of Removal" (Dkt. No. 6), and a "Motion for Declaration of Rights" (Dkt. No. 7.) (Cursory review of the complaint demonstrates that it, too, presents legibility problems.) Thus, despite plaintiff's continuing awareness of this action, he has not responded to the court's order requiring that he either file an in forma pauperis affidavit

24

25

26

Doc. 10

or pay the filing fee. The court will therefore recommend that this action be dismissed. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Plaintiff's "Motion for Declaration of Rights" (Dkt. No. 7) is denied; and 2. The Clerk of Court is directed to randomly assign a district judge to this action. Further, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. 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 21 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). DATED: October 18, 2010 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE knut1867.fifp