UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.	EDCV 17-243	5-R (KS)	Date: March 13, 2018		
Title	Rashad Lamar	King v. M.E. Spearman, W.	arden		
Present: The Honorable: Karen L. Stevenson, United States Magistrate Judge					
Roxanne Horan-Walker			N/A		
Deputy Clerk			Court Reporter / Recorder		
Attorneys Present for Petitioners:			Attorneys Present for Defendants:		

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: DISMISSAL

On December 4, 2017, Petitioner, a California state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a Petition For Writ Of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"). (Dkt. No. 1.) On December 15, 2017, the Court ordered Respondent to respond to the Petition and set deadlines for filing, *inter alia*, a Motion to Dismiss and an Opposition to any Motion to Dismiss. (Dkt. No. 5.) On January 26, 2018, Respondent filed a Motion to Dismiss (the "Motion"). (Dkt. No. 7.) Pursuant to the Court's December 15, 2017 Order, Petitioner's Opposition to that Motion was due within 30 days of the service of the Motion – that is, no later than February 25, 2018. (*See* Dkt. No. 5 at 3.)

Nevertheless, more than two weeks have now passed since the date on which Petitioner's Opposition was due, and Petitioner has not filed a response to the Motion. Local Rule 7-12 states that a party's failure to file a required document, such as an opposition to a motion, "may be deemed consent to the granting [] of the motion." Further, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, an action may be subject to involuntary dismissal if a Petitioner "fails to prosecute or to comply with these rules or a court order." Thus, the Court could properly recommend dismissal of the action for Petitioner's failure to oppose the Motion to Dismiss and to timely comply with the Court's orders.

However, in the interests of justice, Petitioner is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE on or before April 12, 2018** why the action should not be dismissed under Local Rule 7-12 and Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Petitioner's response to this

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No	EDCV 17-2435-R (KS)	Date: March	13, 2018		
Title <u>F</u>	Rashad Lamar King v. M.E. Spearman, Warden				
complying extension t	include <u>either</u> : (1) a complete and detailed oppose with the Local Rules) to the Motion to Dismiss; o file the Opposition accompanied by a sworn decliblishing good cause for Petitioner's failure to timely	or (2) a rearration (not	equest for an to exceed 3		
signed doc	rnatively, Petitioner may discharge this Order and discurrent entitled a "Notice of Voluntary Dismissal" of the action without prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(a) ocedure.	requesting t	he voluntary		
Petitioner is cautioned that his failure to timely comply with this order will lead to a recommendation of dismissal based on Local Rule 7-12 and Rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.					
	Initials o	f Preparer	: rhw		