

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THE COMMITTEE CONCERNING  
COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT, et al.,  
  
                    Plaintiffs,  
            vs.  
CITY OF MODESTO, et al.,  
  
                    Defendants.

Case No. 1:04-cv-06121 LJO DLB  
  
ORDER TO PLAINTIFFS AND  
DEFENDANT SR911 TO SHOW CAUSE TO  
WHY DISMISSAL SHOULD NOT BE  
ENTERED AND/OR OTHER SANCTIONS  
NOT BE IMPOSED

\_\_\_\_\_ /

On March 2, 2011, counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendant SR911 reported to the Court that the matter had settled. (Docs. 541, 544 ) On April 1, 2011, counsel reported that the settlement agreement had been developed but, due to logistical difficulties in obtaining the signatures on the document, they needed additional time to file the request for dismissal. (Doc. 547) The Court granted an extension to April 22, 2011 for the stipulated dismissal as to this defendants to be filed.

Id. Nevertheless, this stipulated dismissal has not yet been filed.

///  
///  
///  
///  
///

1           Therefore, no later than June 3, 2011, the Plaintiffs and Defendant SR911 are **ORDERED**  
2 to show cause why the matter should not be dismissed and/or other sanctions imposed for their  
3 failure to comply with the Court's order. Alternatively, if the stipulated dismissal is filed before June  
4 3, 2011, the Court will discharge the order to show cause.

5  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: May 17, 2011

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28