IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SCOTT PAPENHAUSEN,

Plaintiff, No. 2: 12-cv-0344 DAD P

vs.

DAVID HOLLISTER, et al.,

Defendants. ORDER

_____/

By order filed July 6, 2012, plaintiff's complaint was dismissed and plaintiff was given thirty days leave to file an amended complaint.[1] Thereafter, plaintiff sought and received an extension of time until September 7, 2012 to file an amended complaint. Nonetheless, to date, plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.

/////

/////

/////

/////

/////

[1] Plaintiff has consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(e). (Doc. No. 4.)

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

DATED: October 1, 2012.

DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DAD:dpw
pape0344.fta