

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

OPINION

(PC) Abdullah v. Santoro

PER CURIAM.

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.” (Id., 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).