

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 JO'VAUGHN TIMMS,

No. C 08-1414 MHP (pr)

8 Plaintiff,

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

9 v.

10 SAN FRANCISCO POLICE
11 DEPARTMENT; et al.,

12 Defendants.
13 _____/

14 On August 1, 2008, mail was sent from the court to plaintiff at the address he
15 provided to the court and was returned undelivered on August 5, 2008, marked "return to
16 sender" and "not in custody." Plaintiff has not provided any address other than the one to
17 which the undeliverable mail was sent. More than sixty days have passed since the mail was
18 returned to the court undelivered. Plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 3-11(a)
19 which requires that a party proceeding pro se must "promptly file with the Court and serve
20 upon all opposing parties a Notice of Change of Address specifying the new address" when
21 his address changes. Local Rule 3-11(b) allows the court to dismiss a complaint without
22 prejudice when mail directed to a pro se party is returned as not deliverable and the pro se
23 party fails to send a current address within sixty days of the return of the undelivered mail

24 For the foregoing reasons, this action is dismissed without prejudice because plaintiff
25 failed to keep the court informed of his address in compliance with Local Rule 3-11(a). The
26 clerk shall close the file.

27 IT IS SO ORDERED.

28 Dated: March 10, 2009



Marilyn Hall Patel
United States District Judge