

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	ED CV 17-01046-FMO (PJW)	Date	July 31, 2017
Title	<i>Charles N. Belssner v. The State of California, et al.</i>		
<hr/>			
Present: The Honorable	Patrick J. Walsh, U.S. Magistrate Judge		
Isabel Martinez	N/A	N/A	
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.	
Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:		Attorneys Present for Defendants	
N/A		N/A	

**Proceedings:** Order to Show Cause Why Complaint Should Not Be Dismissed

On May 25, 2017, Plaintiff Charles Belssner, proceeding *pro se* and in forma pauperis, filed a Complaint against the Riverside County Superior Court, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (civil rights) and 42 U.S.C. § 12101 (the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”)). Plaintiff is hearing and speech impaired and alleges that Defendant Riverside County Superior Court deprived him of his rights under the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. On June 26, 2017, the Court dismissed the Complaint with leave to file a First Amended Complaint by July 12, 2017. The Court has not received a First Amended Complaint or any other communication from Plaintiff.

Accordingly, by **August 17, 2017**, Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE why this action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and/or comply with the Court’s previous order. Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to timely file a response will be deemed consent to the dismissal of this action. In the event Plaintiff wishes to voluntarily dismiss this action, he may complete and return the enclosed Notice of Dismissal form by **August 17, 2017**.

If Plaintiff files a First Amended Complaint by **August 17, 2017**, this Order to Show Cause will be automatically discharged and Plaintiff will not need to file a separate response addressing it.

S:\PJW\Cases-Civil Rights\BELSSNER\OSC Why complaint should not be dismissed.wpd

\_\_\_\_\_: \_\_\_\_ 00  
Initials of Preparer im