

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

ORVILLE M. MORRIS,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CSP-SACRAMENTO, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-2286 AC P

ORDER AND FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

By order issued June 6, 2019, plaintiff’s complaint was dismissed, and thirty days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. ECF No. 17. On July 9, 2019, plaintiff was granted an additional sixty days within which to file an amended complaint. ECF No. 21. Sixty days from that date have now expired, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of Court randomly assign a District Court Judge to this action.

IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(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

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff’s motion to appoint counsel, filed August 29, 2019, was denied on September 5, 2019. ECF Nos. 22, 23, respectively.

1 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections  
2 with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings  
3 and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified  
4 time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153  
5 (9th Cir. 1991).

6 DATED: October 16, 2019

7   
8 ALLISON CLAIRE  
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28