Doc. 36 (PC) Canada v. Lewis 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 RONALD LEE CANADA, No. 2:17-cv-0313-EFB P 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. ORDER AND FINDINGS AND **RECOMMENDATIONS** 14 J. LEWIS, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner, proceeds without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This proceeding was referred to this court by Local Rule 302 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 18 19 § 636(b)(1). 20 On March 1, 2018, the court screened plaintiff's complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 21 § 1915A. The court dismissed the complaint, explained the deficiencies therein and granted 22 plaintiff thirty days in which file an amended complaint to cure the deficiencies. ECF No. 29. 23 The order warned plaintiff that failure to comply would result a recommendation that this action 24 be dismissed. The time for acting passed and plaintiff did not file an amended complaint, or 25 otherwise respond to the court's order. 26 On April 9, 2018, plaintiff filed a notice of change of address. ECF No. 32. On April 18, 27 2018, in an abundance of caution, the court granted plaintiff another 30 day extension of time to ///// 28 1

file his amended complaint and directed the Clerk to re-serve plaintiff with the March 1 order. ECF No. 33. The time for acting has passed and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.<sup>1</sup>

A party's failure to comply with any order or with the Local Rules "may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court." E.D. Cal. L.R. 110. The court may dismiss an action with or without prejudice, as appropriate, if a party disobeys an order or the Local Rules. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1263 (9th Cir. 1992) (district court did not abuse discretion in dismissing pro se plaintiff's complaint for failing to obey an order to re-file an amended complaint to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for pro se plaintiff's failure to comply with local rule regarding notice of change of address affirmed).

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court randomly assign a United States District Judge to this action.

Further, it is hereby RECOMMENDED that this action be DISMISSED without prejudice. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E. D. Cal. L.R. 110.

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)(l). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any response to the objections shall be served and filed within fourteen days after service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to //////

/////

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> He has however, requested a courtesy copy of his original complaint, stating that he cannot file an amended complaint without it. ECF No. 34, 35. The Clerk of the Court properly responded by informing plaintiff that he must pay for copies of documents. Moreover, plaintiff does not need to refer to his original complaint to comply with the court's March 1, 2018 screening order, which summarized plaintiff's allegations and explained why they were deficient. *See* ECF No. 29.

1	appeal the District Court's order. Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); Martinez
2	v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
3	Dated: May 31, 2018.
4	EDMUND F. BRENNAN
5	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	