

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

JAMES BELL,
Plaintiff,
v.
FRANK PENNY LAW FIRM, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-3051 JAM CKD PS

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this action, plaintiff, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, complains about monies that were used from the settlement of a civil action arising out of an auto accident. The complaint, however, does not allege a basis for subject matter jurisdiction in this court. Plaintiff was accordingly ordered to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Plaintiff has not filed a response to the order to show cause. There appears to be no federal question subject matter jurisdiction. Diversity jurisdiction is also lacking because the parties are not diverse.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

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

1 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written
2 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned
3 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Failure to file objections
4 within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v.
5 Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

6 Dated: January 26, 2017

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

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
9 4 bell3051.nosmj.57