

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Glenn Velardi,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	CV 07-627 TUC-RCC (JM)
)	
v.)	REPORT AND
)	RECOMMENDATION
Michael J. Astrue,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr style="width: 40%; margin-left: 0;"/>		

In the Scheduling Order, Plaintiff was ordered to file any desired motions within 30 days of the filing of the answer. *Docket No. 8*. Plaintiff has failed to do so and has not requested a time extension. Plaintiff was warned, “[a]bsent any pending dispositive motions, this case may be dismissed as prescribed in Local Rule LRCiv. 41.1 Rule of Practice.” *Id.* Local Rule Civil 41.1 allows for the dismissal for want of prosecution an action in which there have been “no proceedings for six (6) or more months . . .” No action has occurred in this case in more than six months and the required motions have not been filed.

Based on the foregoing and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Rule 72.1 1.17(d)(2), of the Local Rules – Civil of the United States District Court, District of Arizona, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court, after an independent review of the record, issue an order to show cause and, if cause is not established, dismiss this action with prejudice.

This Recommendation is not an order that is immediately appealable to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Any notice of appeal pursuant to Rule 4(a)(1), Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, should not be filed until entry of the District Court's judgment.

