

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV11-3679-CW Date May 1, 2012

Title Dezjole Washington v. Michael J. Astrue (Comm'r Soc. Sec. Admin.)

Present: The Honorable Carla Woehrl, United States Magistrate Judge

Donna Y. Thomas

n/a

n/a

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

n/a

n/a

Proceedings: (In Chambers)

On March 27, 2012, Plaintiff's counsel filed a motion seeking to withdraw as counsel of record in this matter. [Docket no. 23.] In the motion, counsel indicated that she informed Plaintiff by letter and telephone that she was filing the motion to withdraw, that Plaintiff initially indicated she was seeking another attorney's opinion, that Plaintiff did not respond to any of counsel's attempts to contact her after March 8, 2012, and that at about that time Plaintiff's telephone number was no longer valid. [Id.]

On March 28, 2012, the court issued a minute order by which Plaintiff was given until April 16, 2012, to file a response to counsel's motion, and the clerk of the court was directed to serve a copy of the order directly on Plaintiff at her last known address. [Docket no. 24.] On April 10, 2012, the copy of the minute order to be served on Plaintiff was returned as undeliverable. Counsel's motion to withdraw was granted, and counsel was directed to provide the court with any updated contact information for Plaintiff before April 25, 2012. [Docket no. 25.] The allotted time has elapsed, and counsel has not submitted any supplemental contact information for Plaintiff. Nor has Plaintiff filed a notice indicating she has retained new counsel or wishes to proceed pro se, or otherwise communicated with the court.

It is well established that district courts have authority to dismiss actions for failure to prosecute or to comply with court orders. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Omstead v. Dell, Inc., 594 F.3d 1081, 1084 (9th Cir. 2010)(standard applied in dismissal for failure to prosecute); Link v. Wabash Railroad Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-30, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 8 L. Ed. 2d 734 (1962)(dismissal for failure to prosecute to avoid undue delay or congestion in court calendars); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with any court order). Accordingly, Plaintiff is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, in writing, on or before May 31, 2012**, why this action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Plaintiff may

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV11-3679-CW

Date May 1, 2012

Title Dezjole Washington v. Michael J. Astrue (Comm'r Soc. Sec. Admin.)

satisfy the order to show cause by filing a notice of substitution of counsel reflecting new representation or, alternatively, Plaintiff's appearance pro se. The clerk of the court is directed to attempt to serve this order on Plaintiff at both of her prior known addresses, indicated below.

cc: Dezjole Washington
2415 W 6th St.
Los Angeles, CA 90057

Dezjole Washington
4531 E. Madison Ave.
Fresno, CA 93737

Assistant US Attorney LA-CV
AUSA - Office of US Attorney
Civil Division
300 North Los Angeles Street Suite 7516
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Susan L Smith
SAUSA - Office of US Attorney
US Department of Justice
160 Spear Street
Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105