

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Dohrman v. Placer County Sheriff's Office

Dohrman · No. 2:25-cv-1934 CKD P · Decided August 27, 2025

SUMMARY

The court recommends dismissal without prejudice of Anthony Jonathan Dohrman’s action against the Placer County Sheriff’s Office and others because he failed to submit an in forma pauperis application or pay the filing fee as ordered. The findings and recommendations were issued under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), with fourteen days provided for objections.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Carolyn Delaney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 27, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-1934 CKD P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se prisoner plaintiff failed to submit a completed in forma pauperis application or pay the filing fee after being ordered to do so. The magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations that the action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to comply with the court's order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Anthony Jonathan Dohrman v. Placer County Sheriff's Office, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- section 1983
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice when plaintiff failed to comply with the court's order to file an in forma pauperis application or pay the filing fee.

HOLDINGS

1. The magistrate judge recommended that the action be dismissed without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) because plaintiff failed to comply with the court's order.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had previously ordered Anthony Jonathan Dohrman to file a completed in forma pauperis application or pay the filing fee within thirty days. Dohrman did neither. Although his copy of the order appeared to have been returned, the court found that he had been properly served and remained responsible for keeping the court informed of his current address.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On July 15, 2025, the court ordered plaintiff to file a completed in forma pauperis application or pay the filing fee within thirty days and warned that noncompliance would result in a recommendation of dismissal. Plaintiff did not respond within the allotted period. Although the order was returned as undeliverable, the court found plaintiff was properly served under Local Rule 182(f), ordered assignment of a district judge, and recommended dismissal without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

(PC) Dohrman v. Placer County Sheriff's Office

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 ANTHONY JONATHAN DOHRMAN, No. 2:25-cv-1934 CKD P

12 Plaintiff,

13 v. ORDER AND

14 PLACER COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 On July 15, 2025, plaintiff was ordered to file a completed in forma pauperis application 19 or pay the filing fee within thirty days and was cautioned that failure to do

so would result in a 20 recommendation that this action be dismissed. The thirty-day period has now expired, and 21 plaintiff has not responded to the court's order. 22 Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the July 15, 2025, order was 23 returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court 24 apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents 25 at the record address of the party is fully effective. 26 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court assign a district 27 court judge to this case; and 28 //] IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See 2 || Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). 3 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge 4 | assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days 5 || after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections 6 || with the court. Plaintiff advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may 7 || waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 8 || 1991). 9 | Dated: August 27, 2025 ☐☐ I / dip Ze

10 CAROLYN DELANEY

11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12 13 14], 5 dohr1934-fifp 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28