

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

MICHAEL LUJAN,
Plaintiff,
v.
PLACER SUPERIOR COURT,
Defendant.

No. 2:13-cv-02205 DAD P

ORDER AND
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

By an order filed November 12, 2013, this action was re-opened and plaintiff was ordered to file an in forma pauperis affidavit or pay the appropriate filing fee within thirty days. Plaintiff was cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. The thirty day period has now expired, and plaintiff has not responded to the court's order and has not filed an in forma pauperis affidavit or paid the appropriate filing fee.


Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is directed to randomly assign this case to a District Judge.

Also, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice.

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

1 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Any response to the
2 objections shall be filed and served within fourteen days after service of the objections. The
3 parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to
4 appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

5 Dated: January 6, 2014

6 

7 _____
8 DALE A. DROZD
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 DAD:4
11 luj2205.fifp

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28