

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CRAIG A. EDMONDS, JR.,	)	No. C 11-4320 LHK (PR)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER DIRECTING
v.	)	PLAINTIFF TO FILE A NOTICE
	)	OF INTENT TO PROSECUTE
	)	AND TO PROVIDE COURT
ALAMEDA COUNTY DISTRICT	)	WITH CURRENT ADDRESS
ATTORNEY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

On August 31, 2011, Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a federal civil rights complaint, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On October 21, 2011, the Court dismissed the complaint with leave to amend, and ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within thirty days, or face dismissal of this action. On November 3, 2011, the order was returned to the Court as undeliverable because Plaintiff is no longer in custody.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), a district court may *sua sponte* dismiss an action for failure to prosecute or to comply with a Court order. *See Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 633 (1962); *McKeever v. Block*, 932 F.2d 795, 797 (9th Cir. 1991). But such a dismissal should only be ordered when the failure to comply is unreasonable. *See id.* The Court should afford the litigant prior notice of its intention to dismiss. *See Malone v. United States Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 133 (9th Cir. 1987). Furthermore, 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 Civil L.R. 3-11(a).*

