

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

MICHAEL AUSTELL,
Plaintiff,
v.
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO,
Defendant.

No. 2:20-cv-1103 DB P

ORDER AND
FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

A recent court order was served on plaintiff’s address of record and returned by the postal service. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), 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 plaintiff has failed to notify the Court of a current address.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the clerk of the court randomly assign a United States District Judge to this action; and

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. See Local Rule 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, plaintiff may file written objections

1 with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings
2 and Recommendations.” Any response to the objections shall be filed and served within fourteen
3 days after service of the objections. Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the
4 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951
5 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

6 Dated: November 30, 2020

7
8 
9 DEBORAH BARNES
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 /DLB7;
DB/Inbox/Routine/aust1103.33a

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28