## 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 TRAVIS RUTLEDGE, No. 2:18-cv-1723 CKD P 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. ORDER AND 14 LASSEN COUNTY DISTRICT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ATTORNEY, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 By order filed October 18, 2018, plaintiff's complaint was dismissed and thirty days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. The thirty-day period has now expired, and plaintiff 18 19 has not filed an amended complaint. Although it appears from the court's docket that plaintiff's 20 copy of the court's October 18, 2018 order was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the 21 plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to 22 Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court assign a district 23 24 court judge to this case; and IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See 25 26 Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). 27 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge 28 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen after

1	being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with	
2	the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and	
3	Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time	
4	waives the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir.	
5	1991).	
6	Dated: November 30, 2018	Carop U. Delany
7		CAROLYN K. DELANEY
8		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9		
10		
11	1	
12	rutl1723.fta	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		