1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	RICHARD EUGENE TATUM,	No. 2:15-cv-0551-EFB P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	JEFFREY A. BEARD, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42	
18	U.S.C. § 1983. This proceeding was referred to this court by Local Rule 302 pursuant to 28	
19	U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and is before the undersigned pursuant to plaintiff's consent. See 28 U.S.C.	
20	§ 636; see also E.D. Cal. Local Rules, Appx. A, at (k)(4).	
21	On April 28, 2017, the court screened plaintiff's amended complaint pursuant to 28	
22	U.S.C. § 1915A. The court dismissed plaintiff's amended complaint, explained the deficiencies	
23	therein and granted plaintiff thirty days in which file an amended complaint to cure the	
24	deficiencies. ECF No. 22. The order warned plaintiff that failure to comply would result in this	
25	action being dismissed for failure to prosecute. The time for acting has passed and plaintiff has	
26	not filed an amended complaint, or otherwise responded to the court's order. <sup>1</sup>	
27	<sup>1</sup> Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the order was returned, he was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address	
28		ervice of documents at the record address of the
		1

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 without prejudice.	
11	Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E. D. Cal. Local Rule 110.	
12	Dated: June 6, 2017.	
13	EDMUND F. BRENNAN	
14	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	party is fully effective.	
	2	