

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

WARREN WILLIAMS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

No. CIV S-11-2090 MCE DAD PS

v.

INDYMAC BANK, FSB, et al.,

Defendants.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

_____ /

By order signed December 12, 2011, plaintiffs’ pro se complaint was dismissed and they was granted leave to file an amended complaint curing the defects noted in that order. Plaintiffs were granted twenty-eight days from the date of the order to file an amended complaint and were cautioned that failure to respond to the court’s order in a timely manner may result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. The twenty-eight-day period has expired, and plaintiffs have not responded to the court’s order in any manner.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

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 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiffs may file written objections with the court. A document containing objections should be titled “Objections

1 to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiffs are advised that failure to file
2 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. See
3 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

4 DATED: February 29, 2012.

5
6 
7 _____
8 DALE A. DROZD
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 DAD:6
9 Ddad1\orders.pro se\williams2090.fta.f&r

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26