

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

LIUDMYLA IEGOROVA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
LIGHT HOUSE APARTMENTS,  
Defendant.

No. 2:18-cv-00971-JAM-GGH  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff filed her complaint pro se on April 19, 2018, ECF No. 1, and was granted in forma pauperis status on May 29, 2018. ECF No. 3 at 17-19. On the same date this court dismissed plaintiff’s complaint for failing to state a basis for jurisdiction in this federal district court and gave plaintiff 45 days in which to file an amended complaint that conformed to the instructions given in the Order. ECF No. 3.

Plaintiff, however, did not file any amended complaint thereby apparently conceding that she could not do so under the limits explained in the court’s Order.

In light of the foregoing IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

1. Plaintiff’s complaint should be dismissed without further leave to amend;
2. The Clerk should be instructed to close this case;

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

3. No certificate of appealability should be issued.

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 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 and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive her right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991).

Dated: August 2, 2018

/s/ Gregory G. Hollows  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE