

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

RODNEY ALLEN WILLIAMS
Plaintiff,
v.
BRUNKHORST, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:18-cv-01163-CKD-P

ORDER AND
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By order filed February 6, 2019, plaintiff’s complaint was dismissed and thirty days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. Plaintiff was granted two additional extensions of time to comply with this order. ECF Nos. 15, 17. The allotted time has now expired, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court’s order. Plaintiff has consented to this court’s jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) and Local Rule 302.


Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of Court randomly assign this matter to a district court judge.

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 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections

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

5 Dated: July 23, 2019



6 CAROLYN K. DELANEY
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10

11 12/will1163.fta.docx
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28