

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

STEVEN ROGER CENTER,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
D'AGOSTINI, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:19-cv-0091 AC P

ORDER and  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By order issued January 23, 2020, this court instructed plaintiff to complete and return to the court, within thirty days, the USM-285 forms necessary to effect service on defendants. See ECF No. 16. That thirty-day period has since passed, and plaintiff has not responded in any way to the court's order.

It appears from the record that on February 20, 2020, plaintiff's copy of the order was returned. However, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to 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 Court randomly assign a District Court Judge to this action.

///

///

1 IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See  
2 Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

3 These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge  
4 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty-one days  
5 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections  
6 with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Findings and  
7 Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time  
8 may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th  
9 Cir. 1991).

10 DATED: April 30, 2020

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