

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

CAMPOS-RODRIGUEZ,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
DAGOSTINI, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-1448 KJM DB P

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff is a county inmate proceeding pro se with an action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges defendants violated his right of access to the court by failing to provide him with adequate law library facilities. (ECF No. 1.)


On July 2, 2018, the court screened and dismissed plaintiff’s complaint. (ECF No. 11.) Plaintiff was directed to file an amended complaint within thirty days and warned that failure to do so may result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Thereafter, plaintiff did not file an amended complaint.

By order dated August 16, 2018, plaintiff was ordered to dismiss this action or file an amended complaint within fourteen days. (ECF No. 13.) Plaintiff was again warned that failure to comply with the court’s order may result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Those fourteen days have passed and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint, notified the court he wishes to dismiss the action, or otherwise responded to the court’s order.

1           Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without  
2 prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

3           These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge  
4 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days  
5 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections  
6 with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings  
7 and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified  
8 time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153  
9 (9th Cir. 1991).

10 Dated: September 11, 2018

11  
12   
13 DEBORAH BARNES  
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15 DLB:12  
16 DLB:1/Orders/Prisoner.Civil.Rights/camp1448.fsc

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28