1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JOSE RAMOS,	No. 2:22-cv-00004 TLN DB P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
14	CALIFORNIA DEPT OF	
15	CORRECTIONS, et al.,  Defendants.	
16	Defendants.	
17		
18	By order filed June 13, 2023, a recommendation to dismiss plaintiff's complaint was	
19	vacated and thirty days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. The thirty day period	
20	has now expired, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the	
21	court's order.	
22	Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the order was returned, plaintiff	
23	was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current	
24	address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of	
25	the party is fully effective.	
26	For the foregoing reasons, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be	
27	dismissed without prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).	
28	////	

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 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time waives the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

Dated: July 28, 2023

DLB7 ramo0004.fta.nca

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE