

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

JOE MAMERY KAPPYA II,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION, et al.,

Defendants,

No. 2:19-cv-2091 MCE DB PS

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff Joe Kappia is proceeding in this action pro se. This matter was referred to the undersigned in accordance with Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). By order signed March 31, 2020, plaintiff’s complaint was dismissed, and plaintiff was granted leave to file an amended complaint that cured the defects noted in that order. (ECF No. 3.) Plaintiff was granted sixty days from the date of that order to file the amended complaint and was specifically cautioned that the failure to respond to the court’s order in a timely manner would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. (*Id.* at 5.) The sixty-day period has expired, and plaintiff has not responded to the court’s order in any manner.

///
///
///

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without
2 prejudice. See 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 thirty days after
5 being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with
6 the court. A document containing objections should be titled “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s
7 Findings and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the
8 specified time may, under certain circumstances, waive the right to appeal the District Court’s
9 order. See *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

10 Dated: October 12, 2020

11
12
13 
14 DEBORAH BARNES
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 DLB:6
24 DB\orders\orders.pro se\kappia2091.fta.f&rs
25
26
27
28