UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	4

TAMMY SUE LARA,

Petitioner,

v.

JUDGES OF SUPERIOR COURT MONTEREY COUNTY, et al.,

Respondents.

Case No. 16-cv-04496-JST (PR)

## ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Petitioner, an inmate at the Monterey County Jail, filed the instant pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The federal petition has a signature date of June 24, 2016, and was mailed to the United States District Court for the District of Idaho. The petition later was transferred to the Northern District of California. By order entered November 10, 2016, the Court found petitioner had failed to state cognizable claims for habeas corpus relief, and dismissed the petition with leave to amend. On December 6, 2016, the order was returned to the Court as undeliverable because petitioner was not at the address she had provided.

Pursuant to Northern District Local Rule 3-11, a party proceeding pro se whose address changes while an action is pending must promptly file a notice of change of address specifying the new address. See L.R. 3-11(a). The Court may, without prejudice, dismiss a complaint when:

(1) mail directed to the pro se party by the court has been returned to the court as not deliverable, and (2) the court fails to receive within sixty days of this return a written communication from the pro se party indicating a current address. See L.R. 3-11(b).

More than sixty days have passed since the mail directed to petitioner by the Court was returned as undeliverable. The Court has not received a notice from petitioner of a new address.

## United States District Court Northern District of California

Accordingly, the instant habeas action is DISMISSED without prejudice pursuant to Rule 3-11 of the Northern District Local Rules. The Clerk shall terminate all pending motions and close the file. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: February 7, 2017 nited States District Judge