I

1	
2	
3	
4	
6	
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	JOE VASQUEZ,
10	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-10-3254 MCE GGH (P)
11	VS.
12	ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER et al.,
13	Defendants. ORDER AND
14	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
14	
14 15	
14 15 16	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS / Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se who seeks relief pursuant to U.S.C.
14 15 16 17	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS / Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se who seeks relief pursuant to U.S.C. § 1983. On January 3, 2011, the undersigned filed an order dismissing the complaint for failure
14 15 16 17 18	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS / Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se who seeks relief pursuant to U.S.C. § 1983. On January 3, 2011, the undersigned filed an order dismissing the complaint for failure to state a constitutional claim and giving plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint within
14 15 16 17 18 19	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS / Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se who seeks relief pursuant to U.S.C. § 1983. On January 3, 2011, the undersigned filed an order dismissing the complaint for failure to state a constitutional claim and giving plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint within twenty-eight days. On January 27, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS / Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se who seeks relief pursuant to U.S.C. § 1983. On January 3, 2011, the undersigned filed an order dismissing the complaint for failure to state a constitutional claim and giving plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint within twenty-eight days. On January 27, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's order. On March 21, 2011, the district judge affirmed the magistrate judge's
 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS / Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se who seeks relief pursuant to U.S.C. § 1983. On January 3, 2011, the undersigned filed an order dismissing the complaint for failure to state a constitutional claim and giving plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint within twenty-eight days. On January 27, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's order. On March 21, 2011, the district judge affirmed the magistrate judge's order.
 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS / Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se who seeks relief pursuant to U.S.C. § 1983. On January 3, 2011, the undersigned filed an order dismissing the complaint for failure to state a constitutional claim and giving plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint within twenty-eight days. On January 27, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's order. On March 21, 2011, the district judge affirmed the magistrate judge's order. To date, plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint. Rather, on April 21, 2011,
 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS / Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se who seeks relief pursuant to U.S.C. § 1983. On January 3, 2011, the undersigned filed an order dismissing the complaint for failure to state a constitutional claim and giving plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint within twenty-eight days. On January 27, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's order. On March 21, 2011, the district judge affirmed the magistrate judge's order. To date, plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint. Rather, on April 21, 2011, he filed a brief "object[ing] to both the magistrate order filed January 3, 2011 and the district
 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1	Furthermore, plaintiff has failed to file an amended complaint within twenty-eight
2	days of either the magistrate judge's January 3, 2011 order or the district judge's March 21, 2011
3	affirmation of that order. Thus, for the reasons given in the January 3, 2011 order, this action
4	will be dismissed with prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).
5	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's April 21, 2011 motion
6	for reconsideration (Doc. #15) is denied as inapposite.
7	Also, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED, for the reasons given in the January 3,
8	2010 order, that this action be dismissed with prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P.
9	41(b).
10	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District
11	Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within
12	fourteen (14) days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file
13	written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate
14	Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any response to the objections shall be filed and
15	served within fourteen days after service of the objections. Plaintiff is advised that failure to file
16	objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order.
17	DATED: May 5, 2011
18	/s/ Gregory G. Hollows
19	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
20	vasq3254.58ggh
21	ggh:14
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2

I

I