

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 JAMES LEE MATHEWS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

No. 2:23-cv-00922 DB P

ORDER AND FINDINGS &
RECOMMENDATIONS

17 By order filed February 16, 2024, plaintiff's complaint was found to not state any
18 cognizable claims and thirty days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. Thirty days
19 from that date have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise
20 responded to the court's order. Accordingly, plaintiff's complaint should be dismissed without
21 further leave to amend for the reasons set forth in the order filed February 16, 2024. (ECF No.
22 11.)

23 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is
24 directed to assign a district judge to this case; and

25 IT IS RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without further leave to amend for
26 failure to state a claim.

27 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge
28 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty-one (21)

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

6 Dated: March 28, 2024

7
8
9 math0922.fta.fr


DEBORAH BARNES
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE