

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

REGINALD EDWARD SPEARMAN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
STEPHANIE CLENDENIN, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2: 21-cv-1213 TLN KJN P

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

By order filed May 18, 2022, plaintiff was ordered to show cause, within twenty-one days, why his action should not be dismissed. The twenty-one day period has expired, and plaintiff has not shown cause or otherwise responded to the court’s order.


Although it appears from the file that plaintiff’s copy of the order was returned, 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 RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(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: June 8, 2022

7   
8 

---

KENDALL J. NEWMAN  
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 /spea1213.fsc

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