

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

RAGHVENDRA SINGH,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

FOLSOM STATE PRISON,

 Defendant.

No. 2:23-cv-00058-DAD-JDP (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING
THIS ACTION DUE TO PLAINTIFF’S
FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND FAILURE
TO OBEY A COURT ORDER

(Doc. No. 8)

Plaintiff Raghvendra Singh is a former state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On July 5, 2023, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that this action be dismissed due to plaintiff’s failure to prosecute and failure to comply with a court order. (Doc. No. 8.) Specifically, because the magistrate judge found that plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim in his complaint, on April 7, 2023, the magistrate judge issued an order dismissing this action with leave to amend and requiring plaintiff to file an amended complaint within thirty (30) days of that order. (Doc. No. 5.) Plaintiff was warned that his failure to comply with that order may result in the dismissal of this action. (*Id.* at 3.) On May 18, 2023, plaintiff moved for a 60-day extension of time to file his amended complaint. (Doc.

1 No. 6.) The assigned magistrate judge granted plaintiff's motion in part and ordered plaintiff to
2 file an amended complaint by June 19, 2023. (Doc. No. 7.) To date, plaintiff has not filed an
3 amended complaint and the deadline to do so has passed.

4 Accordingly, on July 5, 2023, the magistrate judge issued the pending findings and
5 recommendations recommending dismissal of this action due to plaintiff's failure to prosecute
6 and failure to obey a court order. (Doc. No. 8.) Those pending findings and recommendations
7 were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within
8 fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.* at 2.) To date, no objections have been filed and the time in
9 which to do so has now passed.

10 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a
11 *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings
12 and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

13 Accordingly,

- 14 1. The findings and recommendations issued on July 5, 2023 (Doc. No. 8) are
15 adopted;
- 16 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice due to plaintiff's failure to prosecute
17 this action and failure to comply with a court order; and
- 18 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: August 4, 2023

21 
22 _____
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE