

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

ROBERT MARQUETTE,
Plaintiff,
v.
NEGOUCHI et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-1790 MCE AC P (TEMP)

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS


A recent court order was served on plaintiff’s address of record and returned by the postal service. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 182(f), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than sixty-three days have passed since the postal service returned the court order, and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for plaintiff’s failure to keep the court apprised of his current address. See Local Rule 183(b); Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 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 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings

1 and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified
2 time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153
3 (9th Cir. 1991).

4 DATED: December 3, 2015

5 
6 ALLISON CLAIRE
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28