

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	ED CV 22-1910 SB (MRW)	Date	January 18, 2023
Title	Reeves v. City of Palm Springs		

Present:	Hon. Michael R. Wilner, U.S. Magistrate Judge		
	James Muñoz		n/a
	Deputy Clerk		Court Reporter / Recorder
	Attorneys for Plaintiff:		Attorneys for Defendant:
	n/a		n/a

Proceedings: ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE: DISMISSAL

1. This is a pro se civil rights action. In December, one of the municipal defendants moved to dismiss the action for a variety of reasons. (Docket # 10.)
2. The Court directed Plaintiff Reeves to file and serve her response to the motion by January 13. (Docket # 11.) The order also required Ms. Reeves to explain why she failed to participate in the mandatory pre-motion conference required under the Local Rules. The Court's order specifically informed Plaintiff that failure to file timely materials could result in the dismissal of the action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41.
3. Plaintiff did not file a response by the deadline. The municipality filed a notice observing that failure and requesting relief from the remainder of the motion practice schedule. (Docket # 18 at 2.)
4. Because Ms. Reeves is not an electronic filer (she likely files materials in person or by U.S. Mail), the Court waited several days to see whether this unrepresented party would file anything after the noticed deadline. She didn't. The Court further observes that Ms. Reeves apparently failed to respond to further e-mail inquiries from the defense regarding her intentions in this civil case. (Id.)
5. The request of the City of Beaumont for relief is therefore GRANTED. The February 1 hearing on the dismissal motion is VACATED – no appearance is required for any party.
6. Instead, as a final accommodation to a self-represented litigant, Ms. Reeves is ordered to show cause why the action should not be dismissed in its entirety for failure to oppose the motion and for failure to comply with Court orders. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41; L.R. 7-12 (unopposed motion serves as consent to requested relief). Ms. Reeves will

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	ED CV 22-1910 SB (MRW)	Date	January 18, 2023
Title	Reeves v. City of Palm Springs		

respond to this OSC by sworn written statement to be received by the Court no later than February 8. After that, the Court will take the matter under review.

* * *

7. The parallel motion of the City of Palm Springs is also taken OFF CALENDAR pending the outcome of this OSC. To the extent other defendants appear in the action, no responsive pleading will be required until further order of the Court. You can essentially consider the action stayed at present.