

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS H. SPITTERS,
Plaintiff,
v.
UNKNOWN,
Defendant.

Case No. 15-cv-04902-JSC

**AMENDED FURTHER ORDER RE:
PLAINTIFF'S IN FORMA PAUPERIS
APPLICATION**

United States District Court
Northern District of California

Plaintiff Thomas H. Spitters, proceeding pro se, filed this civil action against unknown defendant(s) on October 23, 2015. His complaint was accompanied by an in forma pauperis application. (Dkt. No. 2.) Because the application was incomplete, the Court denied it without prejudice to re-filing a completed in forma pauperis application, a copy of which was attached to the Court's Order. (Dkt. No. 4.) The Court also sent Plaintiff a copy of the form for consenting or declining to consent to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge. (Dkt. No. 6.) Subsequently, Plaintiff filed a series of documents requesting acknowledgment of his filings, listing names of individuals, asking questions regarding the paperwork that was mailed to him, requesting original signatures in lieu of facsimile signatures on documents sent by the Court, and returning copies of the paperwork sent by the Court including the blank in forma pauperis application and the consent or declination form. On December 1, 2015, the Court issued an Order addressing these filings and giving Plaintiff until December 21, 2015 to file a complete in forma pauperis application.

To date, Plaintiff has not responded to the Court's Order or otherwise communicated with the Court. Accordingly, Plaintiff will be given one final opportunity—**until January 19, 2016**—to submit a renewed application to proceed in forma pauperis or pay the filing fee. Failure to do so by January 18 may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R.

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

Civ. Pro. 41(b).

Plaintiff is reminded that because this action has been randomly assigned to the undersigned magistrate judge, by statute Plaintiff must affirmatively consent to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge. Accordingly, Plaintiff may either consent to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge or decline to consent to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge. Plaintiff may withhold his consent without substantive adverse consequences, but he must either decline or consent by completing the attached consent form.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 6, 2016


JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
United States Magistrate Judge