1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	DESHA CARTER,	Case No. 1:07-cv-01736 JLT (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE MATTER SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
13	VS.	
14	C. MUNOZ, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16	/	
17	Plaintiff is a parolee proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §	
18	1983. In his pretrial statement, filed December 20, 2010, Plaintiff indicated that he may be	
19	unable to attend the jury trial in this matter, which is currently scheduled for February 28, 2011 in	
20	the United States Courthouse in Fresno. (Doc. 70 at 6.) Plaintiff explains that his conditions of	
21	parole limit his ability to travel more than fifty miles outside of Los Angeles County. (Id.)	
22	On January 11, 2011, the parties appeared before the Court for a trial confirmation	
23	hearing. At that time, the Court raised its concern that Plaintiff would be unable to attend trial	
24	due to his status as a parolee. Plaintiff responded that he was currently in discussion with his	
25	parole officer regarding the matter. Plaintiff appeared confident that an arrangement would be	
26	reached, whereby Plaintiff would be permitted to attend trial but he had not yet received	
27	permission to do so.	
28	Therefore, it is HEREBY ORDERED that no later than February 1, 2011, Plaintiff shall	
		1

1	notify the Court in writing whether he has obtained permission from his parole officer to	
2	attend trial and, if he receives this permission, Plaintiff shall provide written documentation of	
3	the permission given by his parole officer. If Plaintiff is not granted permission, he must notify	
4	the Court whether he will proceed via video conferencing. If he chooses to proceed via video	
5	conferencing, Plaintiff must provide the Court information about the provider for the video	
6	conferencing services, including the contact information for the provider, and the conferencing	
7	instructions.	
8	Plaintiff is advised that his failure to comply with this order, will result in the Court	
9	dismissing his case based upon Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's orders.	
10		
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
12	Dated:January 12, 2011/s/ Jennifer L. ThurstonUNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	