Page 1 of 2

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA PANAMA CITY DIVISION

JORGE L. NIEBLA,
Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 5:09cv216/MCR/EMT

C. O. HOLLISTER, et al.,
Defendants.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This cause is before the court upon referral from the clerk. Plaintiff commenced this action by filing a civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Doc. 1). On June 29, 2009, this court entered an order giving Plaintiff thirty (30) days in which to pay the filing fee or submit a completed motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 4). Plaintiff failed to respond to the order; therefore, on August 4, 2009, the court issued an order requiring Plaintiff to show cause, within twenty (20) days, why this action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with an order of the court (Doc. 5). The time for compliance with the show cause order has now elapsed, and Plaintiff has not paid the filing fee or submitted a completed motion to proceed in forma pauperis.

Accordingly, it is respectfully **RECOMMENDED**:

That this case be **DISMISSED** without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure to comply with an order of the court.

At Pensacola, Florida, this <u>27th</u> day of August 2009.

/s/ Elizabeth M. Timothy

ELIZABETH M. TIMOTHY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

NOTICE TO THE PARTIES

Any objections to these proposed findings and recommendations must be filed within ten days after being served a copy thereof. <u>Any different deadline that may appear on the electronic docket is for the court's internal use only</u>. A copy of objections shall be served upon all other parties. Failure to object may limit the scope of appellate review of factual findings. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636; <u>United States v. Roberts</u>, 858 F.2d 698, 701 (11th Cir. 1988).

Case No: 5:09cv216/MCR/EMT