

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

RICHARD STEWART,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
ROMERO, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-0447 KJM CKD P

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On May 31, 2017, the court ordered plaintiff to complete and return to the court, within thirty days, the USM-285 forms necessary to effect service on five defendants. That thirty day period has passed, and plaintiff has not responded to the court’s order.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

These findings and recommendations will be 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

<sup>1</sup> Although it appears from the court’s docket that plaintiff’s copy of the May 31, 2017 order was returned by the U.S. Postal Service, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff’s responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

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

5 Dated: July 6, 2017

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

10 1  
11 stew0447.fusm  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28