

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

ANTHONY JEROME ARMSTRONG,
Petitioner,
v.
ROBERT NEUSCHMID,
Respondent.

No. 2:18-cv-1810 KJM AC P

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A recent court order was served on petitioner’s address of record and returned by the postal service. It appears that petitioner has failed to comply with Local Rule 182(f), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than sixty-three days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and petitioner has failed to notify the Court of a current address.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for without prejudice for failure to prosecute. See L.R. 183(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, any party may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Any response to the objections shall be filed and served within

1 fourteen days after service of the objections. The parties are advised that failure to file objections
2 within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v.
3 Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

4 DATED: June 30, 2022

5 
6 ALLISON CLAIRE
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28