

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

7

8

Patricia Udoh,

) No. CV09-0908 PHX DGC

9

Plaintiff,

10

v.

) **ORDER**

11

Glencroft,

12

Defendant.

13

14

On May 28, 2010, Defendant Glencroft filed a motion for leave to file an amended answer. Dkt. #41. Plaintiff Patricia Udoh did not file a response to the motion. On June 23, 2010, Defendant filed a motion for summary disposition of its motion for leave. Dkt. #64. The Court will treat Plaintiff’s lack of response as consent to the motion to amend pursuant to Rule 7.2(i) of the Local Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* L.R. Civ. P. 7.2(i) (stating that, if a party fails to “file the required answering memoranda,” “such non-compliance may be deemed a consent to the denial or granting of the motion and the Court may dispose of the motion summarily”)

22

Plaintiff is advised that she must become familiar with, and follow, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Rules of the United States District Court for the District of Arizona (“Local Rules”), which may be obtained in the Clerk of Court’s office. If Plaintiff fails to prosecute this action or comply with the rules or any Court order, the Court may dismiss the action with prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b). *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir.1992) (district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing a pro se plaintiff’s complaint for failing to comply with a court order); *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 54 (9th Cir. 1995) (district court did not err in dismissing a pro se plaintiff’s complaint for

28

1 failing to comply with a local rule).

2 **IT IS ORDERED** that Defendant's motion to amend (Dkt. #41) and motion for
3 summary disposition (Dkt. #64) are granted.

4 Dated this 5th day of July, 2010.

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



David G. Campbell
United States District Judge