

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Young v. County of Alameda

Young · No. 24-cv-03914-PCP · Decided July 22, 2025

OPINION

Young v. County of Alameda

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 WALTER LEE YOUNG, Case No. 24-cv-03914-PCP g Plaintiff, ORDER DISMISSING
ACTION

WITHOUT PREJUDICE

9 v. 10 COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, et al., 11 Defendants. L 13 On April 28, 2025, the Court
dismissed the original complaint because it failed to state a 14 || cognizable claim for relief. Dkt.
No. 16. The Court granted partial leave to amend. See id. The 3 15 amended complaint was due
June 6, 2025, see id., but has not been filed, see generally, Dkt. a 16 Because Plaintiff failed to
amend despite opportunity and a warning of the consequences, 17 || this action is DISMISSED
without prejudice. See Harris v. Mangum, 863 F.3d 1133, 1141-42 Z 18 || (9th Cir. 2017)
(recognizing propriety of dismissing action where plaintiff failed to amend). 19 If Plaintiff
believes he can state a cognizable claim, he may move to reopen this action. See 20 Fed. R. Civ. P.
59, 60. To do this, he must file an amended complaint in accordance with the 21 Court's previous
order and a motion with the words MOTION TO REOPEN written on the first 22 || page. 23 24 IT
IS SO ORDERED. 25 || Dated: July 22, 2025 26 Ze 27 L Coy P. Casey Pitt 28 United States
District Judge