Doc. 30 (HC) Sarmiento v. Hill 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 SAMUEL SARMIENTO, No. 2:13-cv-1338 MCE AC P 12 Petitioner. 13 **FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS** v. 14 RICK HILL, 15 Respondent. 16 17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a petition for a writ of habeas 18 corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. 19 By order filed May 5, 2017, the undersigned found that petitioner had failed to show cause 20 why his petition should not be dismissed for lack of habeas jurisdiction; petitioner was given 21 thirty days to file an amended complaint and convert this action to a civil rights action under 42 22 U.S.C. § 1983. ECF No. 29. Thirty days have now passed and petitioner has not filed an 23 amended complaint or otherwise responded to the order. Accordingly, the undersigned will 24 recommend that the petition be dismissed for lack of habeas jurisdiction as set forth in the May 5, 25 2017 order. 26 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that petitioner's application for a writ of 27 habeas corpus be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction for the reasons set forth in the court's May 5, 28 2017 order (ECF No. 29). 1

These findings and recommendations are 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, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any response to the objections shall be filed and served within fourteen days after service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). allen Clane UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE