

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

JUSTIN NEAL CUCHINE,
Plaintiff,
v.
ARAMARK, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-568-EFB P

ORDER

Plaintiff, an inmate incarcerated at Solano County Sentenced Detention Facility at the time of filing the complaint, is proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This proceeding was referred to this court by Local Rule 302 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and is before the undersigned pursuant to plaintiff’s consent. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636; *see also* E.D. Cal. Local Rules, Appx. A, at (k)(4).

On April 2, 2015, the court screened plaintiff’s complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The complaint was dismissed with leave to file an amended complaint. That order explained the deficiencies in the complaint and granted plaintiff thirty days to file an amended complaint to cure the deficiencies in the original complaint. ECF No. 5. The order warned plaintiff that failure to comply would result in this action being dismissed. The time for acting has passed and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint, or otherwise responded to the court’s order.¹

¹ Although it appears from the file that plaintiff’s copy of the order was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff’s responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current

1 A party's failure to comply with any order or with the Local Rules "may be grounds for
2 imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the
3 inherent power of the Court." E.D. Cal. Local Rule 110. The court may dismiss an action with or
4 without prejudice, as appropriate, if a party disobeys an order or the Local Rules. *See Ferdik v.*
5 *Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1263 (9th Cir. 1992) (district court did not abuse discretion in
6 dismissing pro se plaintiff's complaint for failing to obey an order to re-file an amended
7 complaint to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439,
8 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for pro se plaintiff's failure to comply with local rule
9 regarding notice of change of address affirmed).

10 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED. Fed. R. Civ. P.
11 41(b); E. D. Cal. Local Rule 110, 183(b).

12 Dated: May 7, 2015.

13 

14 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of
the party is fully effective.