

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

CALYSTA SHARP,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES,  
  
Defendant.

No. 2:17-0496 GEB CKD PS

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this action, plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. Because there is no basis for federal subject matter jurisdiction evident in the complaint, plaintiff was 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. It also appears that diversity jurisdiction is also lacking because the parties do not appear to be 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 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written

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

5 Dated: April 5, 2017



---

CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 4 sharp0496.nosmj.57

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28