

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

ERIC W. WARD,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
ARAMARK, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-0608 CKD P

ORDER AND  
FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Recent court orders were served on plaintiff’s address of record and returned by the postal service. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), 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 court orders were returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the Court of a current address.


Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of Court assign a district judge to this action.

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. See Local Rule 183(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

1 with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings  
2 and Recommendations.” Any response to the objections shall be filed and served within fourteen  
3 days after service of the objections. Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the  
4 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951  
5 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

6 Dated: July 1, 2015

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

11 2/mp  
12 Ward0608.33a

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28