1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	NOU VANG,
11	Petitioner, No. CIV S-12-0159 DAD P
12	VS.
13	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,
14	Respondents. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
16	By an order filed February 2, 2012, the court directed petitioner to file a petition
17	for writ of habeas corpus and submit an application to proceed in forma pauperis within thirty
18	days. The thirty day period has now expired, and petitioner has not responded to the court's
19	order and has not filed a petition or application to proceed in forma pauperis.
20	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is dismissed without
21	prejudice. ¹
22	DATED: March 20, 2012. Dale A. Dage
23	DALE A DROZD
24	DAD:9 vang0159.nopetition(2) DALE A. DROZD UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
25	
26	¹ Petitioner previously consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). (See Doc. No. 4.)