1		
2		CERT DE TRAIN FARME
3		DEC 10 2018
4		
5		CLERK US DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BY DEPUTY
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	TRAVIS J. YOUNG,	Case No. 3:18-cv-00497-WQH-WVG
12	CDCR #BF-0681,	ORDER DISMISSING CIVIL
13	Plaintiff,	ACTION PURSUANT
14	VS.	TO 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) AND § 1915A(b) AND FOR FAILING
15	ESCONDIDO POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,	TO PROSECUTE IN COMPLIANCE
16	Defendants.	WITH COURT ORDER REQUIRING AMENDMENT
17		
18		

Travis J. Young ("Plaintiff"), while incarcerated at Wasco State Prison and proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, on March 7, 2018, seeking to sue the Escondido Police Department, the Vista Superior Court, the San Diego County District Attorney's Office in Vista, the Superior Court, the County Probation Department, the Public Defender, as well as San Diego Gas & Electric, and two private citizens for discriminating against him and violating his rights to equal protection in the course of several San Diego County criminal proceedings. See Compl., ECF No. 1 at 1-4, 10-17.¹

¹ Plaintiff later filed a Notice of Change of Address indicating his release from custody. See ECF No. 10.

3:18-cv-00497-WOH-WVG

I. Procedural History

On October 4, 2018, the Court granted Plaintiff's renewed Motion seeking leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("*IFP*"), but dismissed his Complaint for failing to state claim and for seeking damages from defendants who are immune pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and § 1915A(b). *See* ECF No. 11. Plaintiff was notified of his pleading deficiencies, and granted 45 days leave to file an Amended Complaint that fixed them, if he could. *Id.* at 6-9. Plaintiff was also warned that his failure to amend would result in the dismissal of his case. *Id.* at 9-10 (citing *Lira v. Herrera*, 427 F.3d 1164, 1169 (9th Cir. 2005) ("If a plaintiff does not take advantage of the opportunity to fix his complaint, a district court may convert the dismissal of the complaint into a dismissal of the entire action.")).

Plaintiff's Amended Complaint was due on or before November 19, 2018, and two full months have passed since the Court issued its October 4, 2018 Order. But to date, Plaintiff has failed to file an Amended Complaint, and has not requested an extension of time in which to do so.² "The failure of the plaintiff eventually to respond to the court's ultimatum–either by amending the complaint or by indicating to the court that [he] will not do so–is properly met with the sanction of a Rule 41(b) dismissal." *Edwards v. Marin Park*, 356 F.3d 1058, 1065 (9th Cir. 2004).

II. Conclusion and Order

Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** this civil action in its entirety without prejudice because Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which § 1983 relief can be granted and because he seeks damages from defendants who are immune. *See* 28 U.S.C.

² The Court presumes its October 4, 2018 Order was received by Plaintiff at the location indicated on his August 31, 2018 Notice of Change of Address since that Order has *not* been returned to the Clerk by the U.S. Post Office as undeliverable. *See* S.D. Cal. CivLR 83.11.b; *In re Bucknum*, 951 F.2d 204, 207 (9th Cir. 1991) ("Mail that is properly addressed, stamped and deposited into the mails is presumed to be received by the addressee."); *Franco v. Sessions*, 740 F. App'x 869, 872 (9th Cir. 2018) (discussing the delivery of regular and certified mail and the "presum[ption] that postal officers properly discharge their duties.") (citing *Salta v. INS*, 314 F.3d 1076, 1079 (9th Cir. 2002).

§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and § 1915A(b). In addition, the Court **DISMISSES** the case based on Plaintiff's failure to prosecute pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) as required by Court's October 4, 2018 Order requiring amendment. *See* ECF No. 11.

The Court further **CERTIFIES** that an *IFP* appeal would not be taken in good faith pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to enter a final judgment of dismissal and close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

211-118 Dated:

Hon. William Q. Hayes United States District Judge