

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

CHARLES R. BRAND,
Plaintiff,
v.
ANNE MARIE SCHUBERT, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-1811-MCE-EFB P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a county inmate proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On March 29, 2017, the court issued findings and recommendations, which recommended dismissal of this action after plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint in accordance with the court’s February 7, 2017 screening order. The findings and recommendations noted that plaintiff’s copy of the order had been returned to the court, presumably because plaintiff had failed to apprise the court of a change in his address.¹ ECF No. 10.

On April 13, 2017, plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations, stating that there has been no change in his address and that the court’s February 7, 2017 screening order

¹ Upon closer examination, it appears that copies of the court’s February 7, 2017 screening order and accompanying Order Directing Prisoner Payment were mistakenly mailed to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”) instead of the Sacramento County Sheriff. It is likely that the copies returned to the court were actually those sent to CDCR, and not those served on plaintiff at the Rio Cosumnes Correctional Center.

1 was erroneously returned to the court. In an abundance of caution, the court will grant plaintiff an
2 extension of time to comply with the court's February 7, 2017 screening order.²

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff has 30 days from the date of this
4 order to comply with the court's February 7, 2017 screening order. Should plaintiff fail to timely
5 comply, the findings and recommendations will be submitted to the district judge for
6 consideration. The Clerk of the Court shall re-serve plaintiff with a copy of the court's February
7 7, 2017 screening order (ECF No. 7) and shall also re-serve the Sacramento County Sheriff with
8 the Order Directing Prisoner Payment (ECF No. 8).

9 DATED: May 18, 2017.

10 
11 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ² The court notes that filing an amended complaint should not require extensive research.
28 An amended complaint should not include legal citations and need not contain unnecessarily
detailed factual allegations.