1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	MARTIN LEE FOSTER,	No. 2:22-cv-01923-DAD-CKD (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING
14	SACRAMENTO PAROLE DEPT. NORTH HIGHLANDS, et al.,	ACTION DUE TO PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO PROSECUTE
15	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 10)
16	Derendants.	(Doc. No. 10)
17	Plaintiff Martin Lee Foster is a former county jail inmate proceeding pro se in this civil	
18	rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States	
19	Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On November 7, 2022, the court directed plaintiff to either file an application to proceed	
21	in forma pauperis or pay the required \$402.00 filing fee in order to proceed with this action.	
22	(Doc. No. 7.) Plaintiff did not file an application to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> nor pay the	
23	required filing fee.	
24	Accordingly, on December 21, 2022, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and	
25	recommendations recommending that this action be dismissed, without prejudice, due to	
26	plaintiff's failure to prosecute this action. (Doc. No. 10.) The pending findings and	
27	recommendations were served on plaintiff at his address of record and contained notice that any	
28	objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (<i>Id.</i> at 1–2.) To date,	
		l

I

1	no objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed, and the time in which to do	
2	so has now passed. ¹	
3	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a	
4	de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the	
5	findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.	
6	Accordingly:	
7	1. The findings and recommendations issued on December 21, 2022 (Doc. No. 10)	
8	are adopted in full;	
9	2. This action is dismissed, without prejudice, due to plaintiff's failure to prosecute	
10	this action; and	
11	3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.	
12	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
13	Dated: April 18, 2023 Dale A. Drogd	
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26	¹ The service copy of the findings and recommendations, which was mailed to plaintiff at his address of record, was returned to the court marked as "Undeliverable." Thus, plaintiff was	
27	required to file a notice of his change of address with the court no later than March 13, 2023. To date, plaintiff has not filed a notice of his change of address or otherwise communicated with the	
28	court.	
	2	