

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

No.	CV 14-02498-ODW (SHx)	Date	October 4, 2017
Title	<i>Veronica J. Rowe v. Randall D. Naiman, ESQ, et al.</i>		

Present: The Honorable	Otis D. Wright, II, United States District Judge
-------------------------------	--

Sheila English	Not reported	N/A
----------------	--------------	-----

Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.
--------------	---------------------------	----------

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not present

Not present

Proceedings:

In Chambers

On August 15, 2014, the Court stayed this action pending resolution of a state-court appeal because the result of the state-court action may have had a preclusive effect on Plaintiff's claim in this court. (ECF No. 22.) The Court ordered "[t]he parties to file a status report every 90 days as to the status of the state case and, upon exhaustion of the related state-court appeals, one or both parties may file a motion to lift the stay." (*Id.*) Plaintiff filed status reports from November 2014 through February 2017, at which point she stopped. (*See* ECF Nos. 23–41.) As of her February 2017 status report, it appears that the California Court of Appeal denied Plaintiff's appeal. (ECF No. 41.) Plaintiff claimed she would be filing a Writ of Mandamus in state court. (*Id.*)

On September 1, 2017, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause, in writing, as to why she had not filed a status report as was required by the Court's Order of August 15, 2014. (*See* ECF Nos. 22, 42.) Plaintiff was ordered to respond by October 2, 2017. (ECF No. 42.) Plaintiff still has not responded to the Court's Order.

In light of Plaintiff's pro se status, the Court provides one more opportunity for Plaintiff to show cause as to why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. **Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to timely respond to the Court's Order and/or prosecute this action will result in dismissal of Plaintiff's case.** *See Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629 (1962); *Singh v. Baidwan*, 651 F. App'x 616, 619 (9th Cir. 2016); *Evans v. Ruffin*, No. C-91-0247-SBA, 1992 WL 373204, at *3 (N.D. Cal. June 22, 1992) (dismissing pro se plaintiff's

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

No.	CV 14-02498-ODW (SHx)	Date	October 4, 2017
Title	<i>Veronica J. Rowe v. Randall D. Naiman, ESQ, et al.</i>		

case for failure to comply with court deadline for filing amended pleading); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

The Court hereby **ORDERS** Plaintiff to **SHOW CAUSE**, in writing, no later than **October 11, 2017**, why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

The Court also **ORDERS** Defendant to submit a declaration on, or before, **October 11, 2017**, advising whether Defendant has received any communications from Plaintiff since she filed her last status report on February 16, 2017.

No hearing will be held.

Initials of Preparer SE : 00