

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

11 THERESA FAISON,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF
15 DEPARTMENT, et al.,
16 Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-00129 DAD P

ORDER AND
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By order filed January 30, 2014, plaintiff’s complaint was dismissed and thirty days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. Thirty days from that date have now passed and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint. On February 21, 2014, plaintiff did file with the court an in forma pauperis application as directed by the court in its January 30, 2014 order. However, she has not otherwise responded to the court’s order and, specifically, has not filed an amended complaint.


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

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

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 (14)

1 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written
2 objections with the court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate
3 Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections
4 within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Turner v.
5 Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153, 1156-57 (9th Cir.
6 1991).

7 Dated: May 21, 2014

8 

9 _____
10 DALE A. DROZD
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12 DAD:4
13 fais129.fta
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28