1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	SCOTT PAPENHOUSEN,
11	Plaintiff, No. 2:12-cv-0018 KJM JFM (PC)
12	VS.
13	STEVE CLARK, et al.,
14	Defendants. FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS
15	/
16	By order filed February 17, 2012, plaintiff's complaint was dismissed and thirty
17	days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. The thirty day period has now expired, and
18	plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order.
19	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed
20	without prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).
21	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District
22	Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen
23	days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written
24	objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's
25	Findings and Recommendations." Any response to the objections shall be filed and served
26	within fourteen days after service of the objections. Plaintiff is advised that failure to file
	1

1	
1	objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order.
2	Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
3	DATED: March 27, 2012.
4	AL I MA
5	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6	
7	12
8	pape0018.fta
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2