Little v. Hall et al

Doc. 33

1	which was denied by this Court, Dkt. No. 29. On January 8, 2009, the copy of the Court's
2	order denying Plaintiff's motion for extension of time to prosecute and reinstate discovery
3	proceedings, which was mailed to Plaintiff at the Snohomish County Jail, was returned as
4	undeliverable. Dkt. No. 30. In addition, on December 17, 2008, Plaintiff filed a motion for a
5	copy of the entire record, Dkt. No. 28, which was denied by this Court, Dkt. No. 31. On
6	January 21, 2009, the copy of the Court's order denying Plaintiff's motion for the entire record
7	which was mailed to Plaintiff at the Snohomish County Jail, was also returned as
8	undeliverable. Dkt. No. 32. To date, Plaintiff has not provided the court with a new address,
9	nor has he responded to Defendants' motion for summary judgment.
10	Because well over sixty days have elapsed since mail directed to Plaintiff at his address
11	of record was first returned to the court by the post office as undeliverable, and because
12	Plaintiff has not notified the Court of his current address, this action is DISMISSED without
13	prejudice for failure to prosecute pursuant to Local Rule CR 41(b)(2). A proposed order
14	accompanies this Report and Recommendation.

DATED this 26th day of March, 2009.

YAMES P. DONOHUE

United States Magistrate Judge

ames P. Donolue