

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Abdullah v. Santoro

No. 1:24-cv-0572 JLT CDB (PC) (E.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2025) · No. 1:24-cv-0572 JLT CDB (PC) · Decided
August 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted findings and recommendations recommending dismissal of Jalaal Abdullah’s civil-rights action for failure to keep the Court informed of his current address and comply with a related Court order. The Court dismissed the action without prejudice and directed the Clerk to close the case.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 JALAAL ABDULLAH, Case No. 1:24-cv-0572 JLT CDB (PC) 12 Plaintiff,
ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING THE 13 v.
ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE, AND DIRECTING THE CLERK OF COURT TO 14 KELLY
SANTORO, et al., CLOSE THIS CASE 15 Defendants. (Doc. 12) 16 17 Jalaal Abdullah seeks to
hold the defendants liable for violations of his civil rights while 18 he was incarcerated at North
Kern State Prison.

(See generally Doc. 1.) After the Court issued an 19 order screening Plaintiff’s complaint (Doc.
10), the U.S. Postal Service returned the Court’s order 20 marked “Undeliverable, Not at CSATF/
SP Corcoran, Inactive, Released, Unable to Forward, 21 Return to Sender” on June 9, 2025.

The magistrate judge determined that Plaintiff failed to 22 comply with Local Rule 183(b)—
which requires parties appearing in propria persona to keep the 23 Court informed of their current
addresses—and failed to comply with the Court’s order 24 concerning the same requirement.
(Doc. 12 at 2-3.)

The magistrate judge found terminating 25 sanctions are appropriate, after considering the factors
identified by the Ninth Circuit in n re 26 Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability
Litigation, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006). 27 (Id. at 3-5.)

Therefore, the magistrate judge recommended the Court dismiss the action without 28 prejudice.
(Id. at 6.) 1 The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff at the only address
on 2 || record and informed him that any objections were due within 14 days.! (Doc. 12 at 6.)

In 3 | addition, the Court informed Plaintiff that the “failure to file any objections within the specified 4 | time may result in the waiver of certain rights on appeal.” (/d., citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 5 | F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014).)

Although the Court’s mail was not returned as undeliverable, 6 | Plaintiff did not file any objections and the time to do so expired. 7 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a de novo review of this case. 8 | Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations 9 | are supported by the record and proper analysis.

Thus, the Court ORDERS: 10 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on July 17, 2025 (Doc. 12) are 11 ADOPTED in full. 12 2. The action is DISMISSED without prejudice. 13 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case. 14 15 IT IS SO ORDERED. 16 | Dated: _ August 10, 2025 Charis [Tourn TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | — SS 28 || The Court’s service is deemed fully effective pursuant to Local Rule 182(f).