

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Tarrence Woodard v. California Department of Corrections and
Rehabilitation, et al.**

No. 2:25-cv-2433 CKD P · No. No. 2:25-cv-2433 CKD P · Decided November 21, 2025

OPINION

CDCR

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 TARRENCE WOODARD, No. 2:25-cv-2433 CKD P

12 Plaintiff, 13 v.

14 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF ORDER AND

CORRECTIONS AND

15 REHABILITATION, et al., FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

16 Defendants. 17

18 On October 8, 2025, plaintiff’s amended complaint was dismissed with leave to amend. 19 The
second amended complaint was due on November 10, 2025, and plaintiff has not filed a 20 second
amended complaint. 21 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court
assign a district 22 court judge to this case; and 23 IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this
action be dismissed without prejudice. See 24 Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). 25 These
findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge 26 assigned to the
case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days 27 after being
served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections 28 with the
court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings 1 | and
Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified 2 || time
waives the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th 3 || Cir.
1991). 4 || Dated: November 21, 2025 Card Kt | (£4 (g—

6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7 8 9} 1 10 wood2433.fta 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28