1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	SOLOMON JAMES MICHAEL ANDREWS,	No. 2:18-cv-2891 DB P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	ORDER AND FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
14	RN RUSSO, et al.,	KLCOMMENDATIONS
15	Defendants.	
16	Detendants.	
17		
18	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with an action us	
19	42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges that defendants failed to provide appropriate medical car	
20	Plaintiff filed his original complaint in October 2018. (ECF No. 1.) On screening, this coun	
21	found plaintiff stated no claims potentially cognizable under § 1983. (ECF No. 8.) This co	

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges that defendants failed to provide appropriate medical care. Plaintiff filed his original complaint in October 2018. (ECF No. 1.) On screening, this court found plaintiff stated no claims potentially cognizable under § 1983. (ECF No. 8.) This court gave plaintiff leave to amend. On January 22, 2019, plaintiff filed a first amended complaint. (ECF No. 11.) Again, on screening, this court found no cognizable claims. (Feb. 4, 2019 Order (ECF No. 12).) Plaintiff was given leave to file a second amended complaint. This court also advised plaintiff that if he failed to file a second amended complaint within the thirty days provided or otherwise failed to respond to the court's order, this court would recommend this action be dismissed.

////

More than thirty days have passed since the court issued its February 4, 2019 order and plaintiff has not filed a second amended complaint or any other responsive documents.

Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court is HEREBY ORDERED to randomly assign a district judge to this case.

Further, IT IS RECOMMENDED that this case be dismissed for plaintiff's failure to comply with court orders. See E.D. Cal. R. 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41.

These findings and recommendations will be 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 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 result in waiver of the right to appeal the district court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: March 15, 2019