

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

FONTELLA FRANSCINE NELSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
SHASTA COUNTY COURTS, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-00347 TLN AC PS

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff is proceeding in this action pro se. The action was accordingly referred to the undersigned for pretrial matters by E.D. Cal. R. (“Local Rule”) 302(c)(21). On March 15, 2022, the court granted plaintiff’s in forma pauperis (“IFP”) application but rejected the complaint, granting plaintiff 30 days to file an amended complaint. ECF No. 4. Plaintiff was cautioned that failure to do so could lead to a recommendation that the action be dismissed. Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint within the time limit. On April 20, 2022, the court issued an order to show cause within 14 days why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. ECF No. 5. Plaintiff has not responded to the court’s orders, nor taken any action to prosecute this case.

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed, without prejudice, for lack of prosecution and for failure to comply with the court’s order. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Local Rule 110.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty-one

1 (21) days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written
2 objections with the court. Such document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's
3 Findings and Recommendations." Local Rule 304(d). Plaintiff is advised that failure to file
4 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order.
5 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

6 DATED: May 5, 2022

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