

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

ENRICO PAVAO,  
  
  Plaintiff,  
  
  v.  
  
UNKNOWN,  
  
  Defendant.

No. 2:21-cv-2082 TLN AC P

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On May 10, 2022, the undersigned sua sponte granted plaintiff a thirty-day extension of time to file a first amended complaint. ECF No. 19. This was the fourth extension of time granted for this purpose. See ECF Nos. 13, 15, 17, 19. Plaintiff was warned that his failure to file an amended complaint within the thirty-day period would likely result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. ECF No. 19 at 2.

More than thirty days from that date have now expired, and plaintiff has not filed the first amended complaint, nor has he responded to the court’s order in any way.

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.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified  
3 time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153  
4 (9th Cir. 1991).

5 DATED: June 15, 2022

6   
7 ALLISON CLAIRE  
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28