

United States District Court  
For the 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  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

RENE G. AMADOR,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
TT INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLC,  
  
Defendant.

Case No.: 5:13-cv-01939-PSG

**ORDER THAT CASE BE  
REASSIGNED WITH  
RECOMMENDATION THAT THE  
CASE BE DISMISSED**

On August 6, 2013, Plaintiff Rene G. Amador (“Plaintiff”) failed to appear at a case management conference hearing.<sup>1</sup> In advance of the conference, Plaintiff did not file a case management statement. In light of these facts, the court ordered Plaintiff to show cause by no later than October 7, 2013, as to why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute.<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff did not respond.

<sup>1</sup> See Docket No. 8.


<sup>2</sup> See Docket No. 9.

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

Accordingly, the court hereby ORDERS that this case be reassigned to a district judge with the recommendation that Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed for failure to prosecute.<sup>3</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 16, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL S. GREWAL  
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>3</sup> This court is ordering reassignment to a district judge because, absent consent of all parties, a magistrate judge does not have the authority to make case-dispositive rulings. *See, e.g., Tripathi v. Rison*, 847 F.2d 548, 548-49 (9th Cir. 1988).