| Windom v. U | nknown   |                          |  |
|-------------|--|--------------------------|--|
|             |  |                          |  |
|             |  |                          |  |
| 1           |  |                          |  |
| 2           |  |                          |  |
| 3           |  |                          |  |
| 4           |  |                          |  |
| 5           |  |                          |  |
| 6           |  |                          |  |
| 7           |  |                          |  |
| 8           | IN THE UNITED O  | TATES DISTRICT COLIDT    |  |
| 9           | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA                         |                          |  |
| 10          | FOR THE NORTHERD   | N DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |  |
| 11          | TOM WINDOM,  | ) No. C 10-5694 LHK (PR) |  |
| 12          | Plaintiff,   | ORDER OF DISMISSAL       |  |
| 13          | v.   |                          |  |
| 14          | UNKNOWN,   |                          |  |
| 15          | Defendant.   |                          |  |
| 16          |  | _)                       |  |
| 17          | On December 15, 2010, Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed a motion to appoint counsel,               |                          |  |
| 18          | which commenced this action. The same day, the Clerk notified Plaintiff that he had not paid the     |                          |  |
| 19          | filing fee nor had he filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP"). The Clerk also      |                          |  |
| 20          | notified Plaintiff that he failed to submit a complaint. Along with the deficiency notices,          |                          |  |
| 21          | Plaintiff was provided with a new IFP application, instructions for completing it, and was           |                          |  |
| 22          | notified that he had to specifically include a Certificate of Funds completed and signed by an       |                          |  |
| 23          | authorized officer at the prison, and a stamped return envelope. Plaintiff was further cautioned     |                          |  |
| 24          | that his failure to either file a completed IFP application or pay the filing fee within thirty days |                          |  |
| 25          | would result in the dismissal of this action. Plaintiff was also advised that his failure to file a  |                          |  |
| 26          | complaint within thirty days would result in the dismissal of this action. To date, Plaintiff has    |                          |  |
| 27          | not communicated with the Court.   |                          |  |
| 28          | Accordingly, the instant action is DISMISSED without prejudice to Plaintiff filing a new             |                          |  |
|             | Order of Dismissal   |                          |  |
|             | P:\PRO-SE\SJ.LHK\CR.10\Windom694dis.wpd  |                          |  |
|             |  | Deale                    |  |

Doc. 4

| 1  | action in which he either pays the filing fee or files a completed IFP application, and files a |
|----|---|
| 2  | complaint.  |
| 3  | The Clerk shall enter judgment and close the file.  |
| 4  | IT IS SO ORDERED.   |
| 5  | DATED: 1/29/11  |
| 6  | DATED: 1/29/11  LUCY H. KOH United States District Judge  |
| 7  |   |
| 8  |   |
| 9  |   |
| 10 |   |
| 11 |   |
| 12 |   |
| 13 |   |
| 14 |   |
| 15 |   |
| 16 |   |
| 17 |   |
| 18 |   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 |   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |
| 26 |   |
| 27 |   |
| 28 |   |