

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ford v. Adams

Ford · No. 24-cv-06807-EKL · Decided August 12, 2025

OPINION

Ford v. Adams

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 JASPER FORD, Case No. 24-cv-06807-EKL 8 Plaintiff,

ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITHOUT

9 v. PREJUDICE

10 ADAMS, et al., 11 Defendants. 12 13 On April 22, 2025, the Court screened Plaintiff Jasper
Ford's complaint and filed an order 14 || of dismissal with leave to amend. ECF No. 11. The order
warned Ford that the case may be 3 15 || dismissed if he failed to file an amended complaint
within 28 days. /d. at5. After the mailing was a 16 returned to the Clerk as undeliverable, the
Court updated Ford's address and re-sent the order on 3 17 June 11, 2025. ECF No. 13. More than
two months later, the Court has not received an amended S 18 || complaint, request for extension
of time, or any other communication from Ford. Given that Ford 19 || failed to comply with Civil
Local Rule 3-11 and failed to file an amended complaint, the matter is 20 |} DISMISSED
WITHOUT PREJUDICE. See WMX Techs. v. Miller, 104 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 21 1997)
(holding that further action by district court is necessary where plaintiff fails to amend after 22 ||
dismissal with leave to amend); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1441 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming 23
|| dismissal of pro se prisoner's complaint for failing to notify court of his change of address). 24
The Clerk shall close the file. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 || Dated: August 12, 2025 27 Eumi K.
Lee 28 United States District Judge