

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

CHRISTOPHER PROVOLT,  
Plaintiff,

v.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF  
DEPARTMENT, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-0585 KJN P

ORDER

Plaintiff consented to proceed before the undersigned for all purposes. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). By order filed October 26, 2016, plaintiff’s complaint was dismissed and thirty days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. Plaintiff was cautioned that failure to file an amended complaint may result in the dismissal of this action. Thirty days passed, and plaintiff did not file an amended complaint, or otherwise respond to the court’s order. On December 7, 2016, plaintiff was ordered to show cause why this action should not be dismissed.

Although it appears from the file that plaintiff’s copy of the order was returned, 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  
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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is dismissed without prejudice.

See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

Dated: January 6, 2017

  
KENDALL J. NEWMAN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

/prov0585.fsc