I

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	GOLDYN COOPER,
11	Plaintiff, No. 2:12-cv-00602 DAD P
12	VS.
13	SCOTT HEATLEY, et al., ORDER AND
14	Defendants. <u>FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
15	/
16	On December 20, 2012, this court ordered plaintiff to complete and return to the
17	court, within thirty days, the USM-285 forms necessary to effect service on defendants, a
18	completed summons and four copies of his endorsed complaint. That thirty day period has since
19	passed, and plaintiff has not responded in any way to the court's order.
20	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this case be randomly assigned to a
21	District Judge.
22	Also, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without
23	prejudice. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).
24	These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States
25	District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within
26	fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file
	1
	Deduc

1	written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Findings
2	and Recommendations." Any response to the objections shall be filed and served within
3	fourteen days after service of the objections. Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections
4	within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v.
5	<u>Ylst</u> , 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
6	DATED: January 28, 2013.
7	2
8	Dale A. Drogd DALE A. DROZD
9	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	DAD:4 coop602.fusm
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2

I

I