

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

JOSE RAMOS,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
CALIFORNIA DEPT OF  
CORRECTIONS,  
  
Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-00004 DB P

ORDER AND FINDINGS &  
RECOMMENDATIONS

By order filed September 16, 2022, the court found plaintiff’s complaint did not state a claim and granted thirty days leave to file an amended complaint. On November 2, 2022, the court granted plaintiff an additional 90 days in which to file an amended complaint. That time has expired, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court’s order.


In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is directed to assign a district judge to this case; and

IT IS 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

1 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections  
2 with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned  
3 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that  
4 failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District  
5 Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

6 Dated: March 24, 2023

7  
8   
9 DEBORAH BARNES  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
DLB7  
ramo0004.fta