Northern District of California

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

ANTONIO CRUZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

ALMERIA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-00443-JST

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Plaintiff filed the instant pro se action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that Defendants Dunbar, Almeria, Saechao, Walters, and Dickens have violated his rights under the Due Process Clause. ECF Nos. 1, 9, 37.

Pursuant to Northern District Local Rule 3-11, a party proceeding pro se whose address changes while an action is pending must promptly file and serve upon all opposing parties a notice of change of address specifying the new address. See L.R. 3-11(a). The Court may, without prejudice, dismiss a complaint or strike an answer 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 60 days of this return a written communication from the pro se party indicating a current address. See L.R. 3-11(b).

On July 25, 2019, court mail sent to plaintiff was returned as undeliverable with the notation that he was no longer in custody. ECF No. 39. More than sixty days have passed since the mail sent to petitioner by the court was returned as undeliverable. The court has not received a notice from petitioner of a new address. Accordingly, the instant action is DISMISSED without prejudice. The Clerk of the court shall enter judgment and close the file.

United States District Court Northern District of California

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:

