

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

RODERICK LIPSEY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:08-cv-01726 JLT (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO FILE
AN OPPOSITION OR STATEMENT OF NO
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT’S MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

_____ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On March 14, 2011, Defendant Granillo, the sole defendant in this action, filed a motion for summary judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56. (Doc. 29.) Although Plaintiff was previously advised by the Court of the requirements for filing an opposition to a motion for summary judgment, (see Doc. 18,) Plaintiff has not filed an opposition to the pending motion in accordance with the Local Rules.

Plaintiff is therefore reminded that Local Rule 230(l) provides, in part, that: “Failure of the responding party to file written opposition or to file a statement of no opposition [within twenty-one days after the date of service of a motion] may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion” Local Rule 110 also provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules “may be grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court” including, but not limited to, dismissal of the action.

1 Accordingly, good cause appearing, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that, within thirty (30) days
2 of the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall file an opposition or statement of no opposition to
3 Defendant's March 14, 2011 motion for summary judgment. Defendant shall file a reply, if any,
4 within fourteen (14) days of receipt of Plaintiff's opposition or statement of no opposition.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: April 15, 2011

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE