

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Rodriguez v. Newsom

Rodriguez · No. 2:24-cv-02552-DJC-CKD (PS) · Decided July 25, 2025

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ, No. 2:24-cv-02552-DJC-CKD (PS) 12
Plaintiff, 13 v. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 14 GAVIN NEWSOM, et al., 15
Defendants. 16 17 By order filed June 20, 2025, plaintiff was granted thirty days to file an
amended 18 complaint. Plaintiff was informed that failure to file an amended complaint would
result in a 19 recommendation of dismissal.

(ECF No. 10.) The thirty-day period has now expired, and 20 plaintiff has not filed an amended
complaint nor otherwise responded to the court’s order. 21 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY
RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without 22 prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed.
R. Civ. P. 41(b). 23 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States
District Judge 24 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Within fourteen days 25 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party
may file written 26 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document
should be captioned 27 //// 28 1 | “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and
Recommendations.” Failure to file objections 2 || within the specified time may waive the right to
appeal the District Court’s order.

Martinez v. 3 || Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). 4 | Dated: July 25, 2025 Card ke yy a 5
CAROLYN K DELANEY? 6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 7 8 9 10 11]]
2/odr2552.f&rs-fta 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28