

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

MICHAEL DEAN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
ROMELDA RAUSSER,  
Defendant.

No. 2:17-cv-01361-KJM-GGH

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A court order was served on plaintiff’s address of record on July 12, 201, ECF No.5, and returned by the postal service as undeliverable and unable to forward on July 19, 2017. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in pro se inform the court of any address change. More than sixty-three days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the Court of a current address.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. See Local Rule 183(b).

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, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings

1 and Recommendations.” Any response to the objections shall be filed and served within fourteen  
2 days after service of the objections. Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the  
3 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951  
4 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: September 19, 2017

7 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows  
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28