

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  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

|                        |   |                               |
|------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| TYRONE E. BELL,        | ) | Case No. CV 11-7858-FMO (RNB) |
|                        | ) |                               |
| Plaintiff,             | ) | ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE           |
|                        | ) |                               |
| vs.                    | ) |                               |
|                        | ) |                               |
| COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, | ) |                               |
| et al.,                | ) |                               |
|                        | ) |                               |
| Defendants.            | ) |                               |

---

On March 21, 2013, the Court issued a Minute Order requiring plaintiff to appear before the Court on April 19, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. (i.e., Courtroom 6D of the Santa Ana courthouse) for the purpose of having his deposition conducted under the Court’s auspices. In its Minute Order, the Court expressly admonished plaintiff that, if he was not present when the case was called at 9:00 a.m., he would be sanctioned.

Although plaintiff was not present at 9:00 a.m., the Court waited until approximately 9:20 a.m. before calling the case. Defendants’ counsel was present with a court reporter. Plaintiff was not present.

Based on plaintiff’s failure to appear for his deposition as ordered, and also his failure to comply with the Court’s March 27, 2013 Order re the three deputy defendants’ pending motions for case dispositive sanctions, the Court is now prepared to issue a Report and Recommendation recommending that those three motions be

1 granted.

2 There are no motions for case dispositive sanctions pending on behalf of the  
3 other defendants (i.e., the County of Los Angeles and Sheriff Baca). However, based  
4 on his failure to appear for his duly-ordered deposition (which would have been taken  
5 on behalf of all the defendants), plaintiff is ordered to show cause in writing on or  
6 before **May 20, 2013** why the Court should not also recommend the dismissal of this  
7 action in its entirety pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). Plaintiff is admonished that  
8 his failure to timely file a response to this Order to Show Cause will be deemed by  
9 the Court as another violation of a Court order and also as evidence of his lack of  
10 prosecution, which will constitute another basis for recommending to the District  
11 Judge that this action be dismissed. See Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-  
12 30, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 1388, 8 L. Ed. 2d 734, reh'g denied, 371 U.S. 873, 83 S. Ct. 115,  
13 9 L. Ed. 2d 112 (1962); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 (9th Cir. 1988).

14  
15 DATED: April 19, 2013



16  
17  
18 ROBERT N. BLOCK  
19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28