

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

LEONARDO RAMOS,
Plaintiff,
v.
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FAIR
EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-01610 TLN AC (PS)

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS


Plaintiff is proceeding in this action pro se. The action was accordingly referred to the undersigned for pretrial matters by E.D. Cal. R. (“Local Rule”) 302(c)(21). On March 19, 2018, the court dismissed plaintiff’s complaint with leave to amend. ECF No. 22. On March 20, 2018, the court granted plaintiff 30 days to file an amended complaint. ECF No. 23. Plaintiff was cautioned that failure to do so could lead to a recommendation that the action be dismissed. Plaintiff did not respond. On April 23, 2018 the court issued an order to show cause by May 7, 2018 why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. ECF No. 24. Plaintiff has not respond to the court’s orders, nor taken any action to prosecute this case.

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed, without prejudice, for lack of prosecution and for failure to comply with the court’s order. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Local Rule 110.

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

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty-one (21) days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. Such document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Local Rule 304(d). Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

DATED: May 9, 2018



ALLISON CLAIRE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE