

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SANFORD D. JONES,

CASE NO. 1:07-cv-01207-MJS PC

Plaintiff,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE BY JULY 15,
2010 WHY THIS CASE SHOULD NOT BE
DISMISSED FOR PLAINTFF’S FAILURE TO
COMPLY WITH COURT ORDER

v.

STEPHEN MAYBERG, et al.,

(Doc. 41)

Defendants.

_____ /

Plaintiff Sanford Jones is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed this action on August 20, 2007. On March 5, 2010, the Court granted Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss and granted Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint within thirty days.

Local Rule 11-110 provides that “failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Local Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “in the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal of a case.” Thompson v. Housing Auth., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See, e.g. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order

1 requiring amendment of complaint); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988)
2 (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of
3 address); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to
4 comply with court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for
5 failure to lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

6 To date, Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the Court's
7 March 5, 2010 Order to file an amended complaint within thirty days. Accordingly, Plaintiff is
8 ORDERED to show cause not later than July 15, 2010 why his case should not be dismissed for
9 failure to comply with the Court order.

10
11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: June 12, 2010

/s/ Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE