2011, and expired on May 10, 2011. Plaintiff has not filed evidence that service of process was

1

25

26

/////

Doc. 6

1 2

U

/

DAD:kw

 $Ddad1\ orders.pro\ se\ phillips 0089.rule 4m.dlop.f\&r$

accomplished on the defendant by May 10, 2011, and the defendant has not appeared in this action.

Plaintiff failed to comply with the court's January 24, 2011 order in additional ways. Plaintiff did not file a certificate of service indicating the date and manner of service of the January 24, 2011 order upon defendant, and plaintiff did not file a status report on or before May 6, 2011. Plaintiff was advised that failure to file a timely status report or failure to appear at the status conference "may result in a recommendation that this case be dismissed for lack of prosecution and as a sanction for failure to comply with court orders and applicable rules." (Doc. No. 4 at 3.)

Accordingly, IT IS RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to effect service within the time specified in Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, for failure to comply with the requirements of the court's order filed January 24, 2011, and for failure to prosecute this action in any manner.

These findings and recommendations will be 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 (14) days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. A document containing objections should be titled "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. See Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

DATED: May 20, 2011.

DALE A. DROZD

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE