(PC) Flores	v. Cate et al
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	RAYMOND FLORES,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-10-2832 DAD P
12	VS.
13	M. CATE, et al., ORDER
14	Defendants.
15	
16	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. On
17	November 1, 2010, plaintiff's consent to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge was filed.
18	By order filed April 28, 2011, plaintiff's complaint was dismissed and thirty days
19	leave to file an amended complaint was granted. The thirty-day period has now expired and
20	plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order.
21	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is dismissed without
22	prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).
23	DATED: June 8, 2011.
24	Dale A. Daget
25	DALE A. DROZD
26	flor2832.dismiss UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
	1

Doc. 8