

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

CARY LEE PETERSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
ALAMEDA COUNTY SHERIFF DEPT.,
et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:23-cv-00218-DJC-EFB (PC)

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By order filed August 28, 2023, the court dismissed plaintiff’s complaint was dismissed and granted thirty days leave to file an amended complaint. The thirty day period has now expired, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court’s order.

Although it appears from the file that plaintiff’s copy of the order was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff’s responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

IT IS HEREBY 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

1 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days
2 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written
3 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned
4 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Any response to the
5 objections shall be served and filed within fourteen days after service of the objections. The
6 parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to
7 appeal the District Court’s order. *Turner v. Duncan*, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); *Martinez*
8 *v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

9
10 Dated: December 6, 2023


EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE