

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

PATRICIA A. McCOLM,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
TRINITY COUNTY, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-0773 KJM CKD (PC)

ORDER AND  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff commenced this action in March 2014. On May 29, 2014, the undersigned dismissed the complaint and granted thirty days’ leave to amend. On June 24, 2014, plaintiff was granted a 90-day extension of time to file an amended complaint. On September 24, 2014, plaintiff was granted a further extension of time, until December 23, 2014, to file an amended complaint. That order notified plaintiff that “no further extensions of time will be granted.” The docket indicates that plaintiff was served with the order. To date, plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint; rather, she seeks yet another extension of time (ECF No. 20).

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion for extension of time (ECF No. 20) is denied.

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed. 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 days

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

6 Dated: January 6, 2015

7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 2/ mcco0773.fta  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28