

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

CHARLES E. ADAMS,	)	No. C 12-3729 LHK (PR)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER OF DISMISSAL
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
SAN FRANCISCO POLICE	)	
DEPARTMENT, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

On July 17, 2012, Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed a complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The same day, the Clerk notified Plaintiff that he had not paid the filing fee, nor had he filed a complete application to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”). Along with the deficiency notice, Plaintiff was provided with a IFP application and instructions for completing it. Plaintiff was further cautioned that his failure to either file a completed IFP application or pay the filing fee within thirty days would result in the dismissal of this action.

On July 30, 2012, mail sent from the Court to Plaintiff was returned as undeliverable because Plaintiff had been released from custody. On September 6, 2012, the Court ordered Plaintiff to notify the Court of his current address and indicate whether he intended to continue to prosecute this case within twenty days. On September 20, 2012, Prisoner Legal Services provided Plaintiff’s current address in response to the Court’s order. On October 9, 2012, the Clerk again mailed notice to Plaintiff regarding his still deficient IFP application, which warned Plaintiff that the failure to file a completed IFP application or pay the filing fee within thirty days would result in dismissal.

1 To date, Plaintiff has not indicated whether he wishes to continue to prosecute this action.
2 Moreover, Plaintiff has not filed a completed IFP application nor paid the filing fee.

3 Accordingly, the instant action is DISMISSED without prejudice. The Clerk shall
4 terminate all pending motions, enter judgment, and close the file.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 DATED: 11/15/12


LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge