| 1 | | |
|----|---|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | GREGORY ROOSEVELT POARCH, | Case No. 2:20-cv-01191-JDP (PC) |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THIS ACTION BE DISMISSED FOR |
| 13 | v. | FAILURE TO PROSECUTE, FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT ORDERS, AND |
| 14 | LENICK RANDY, et al. | FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM |
| 15 | Defendants. | OBJECTIONS DUE WITHIN FOURTEEN DAYS |
| 16 | | DATS |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | On September 3, 2020, the previously assigned magistrate judge screened plaintiff's | |
| 20 | complaint, found that it failed to state a claim, and granted plaintiff thirty days to file an amended | |
| 21 | complaint. ECF No. 20. Rather than filing an amended complaint, plaintiff subsequently filed | |
| 22 | four one-page documents that are largely unintelligible. ECF No. 21-23, 25. On October 22, | |
| 23 | 2020, plaintiff was ordered to show cause within thirty days why this action should not be | |
| 24 | dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to state a claim. ECF No. 26. Plaintiff was warned | |
| 25 | that failure to respond to the court's order could result in dismissal of this action. <i>Id.</i> at 2. | |
| 26 | In response, plaintiff filed six documents, which are also unintelligible. ECF No. 27-32. | |
| 27 | Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint, and his recent filings fail to provide a reasonable | |
| 28 | | 1 |
| | | 1 |

| 1 | explanation for his failure to do so. Thus, plaintiff has failed to show cause why this action | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | should not be dismissed. | |
| 3 | Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the clerk of court shall randomly assign a United States | |
| 4 | District Judge to this case. | |
| 5 | Further, it is RECOMMENDED that: | |
| 6 | 1. This action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute, failure to comply | |
| 7 | with court orders, and for failure to state a claim as set forth in the September 3, 2020 order. See | |
| 8 | ECF No. 20. | |
| 9 | 2. The Clerk of Court be directed to close the case. | |
| 10 | These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge | |
| 11 | assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days | |
| 12 | after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written | |
| 13 | objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned | |
| 14 | "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any response to the | |
| 15 | objections shall be served and filed within fourteen days after service of the objections. The | |
| 16 | parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to | |
| 17 | appeal the District Court's order. Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); Martinez | |
| 18 | v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 21 | Dated: December 11, 2020 | |
| 22 | JEREMY D. PETERSON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE | |
| 23 | UNITED STATES WADISTRATE JUDGE | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | 2 | |
| | / | |