

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

MARIA D. PADILLA,
Plaintiff,
v.
UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE, et
al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-02631-GEB-AC (PS)


FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff is proceeding in this action pro se. This matter was accordingly referred to the undersigned by E.D. Cal. 302(c)(21). On November 28, 2016, this Court issued an Order dismissing Plaintiff’s Complaint and allowing Plaintiff 30 days to file an amended complaint. ECF No. 3. The Court warned that failure to file an amended complaint may result in a recommendation by the undersigned that this action be dismissed. *Id.* Plaintiff’s 30 days has long since passed, and she has not filed an amended complaint or taken any other action in this case. Because Plaintiff failed to comply with this Court’s order, the undersigned recommends that this case be DISMISSED.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty-one (21)

1 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written
2 objections with the court. Such document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s
3 Findings and Recommendations.” Local Rule 304(d). Plaintiff is advised that failure to file
4 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order.
5
6 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

7 DATED: June 6, 2017

8 
9 _____
10 ALLISON CLAIRE
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28