

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER WILLIAMS,
Plaintiff,
v.
SACRAMENTO POLICE
DEPARTMENT, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:13-cv-1929 CKD P

ORDER AND
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On October 24, 2014, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. On December 1, 2014, plaintiff was ordered to file an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to the pending motion within thirty days. In the same order, plaintiff was informed that failure to file an opposition would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). The thirty day period has now expired, and plaintiff has not responded to the court's order.

For the foregoing reasons, IT IS HERBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court assign a district court judge to this case; and

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

1 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge
2 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days
3 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written
4 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned
5 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Any response to the
6 objections shall be filed and served within fourteen days after service of the objections. The
7 parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to
8 appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

9 Dated: January 21, 2015



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14 1
15 will1929.46fr
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28