

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

SANTIAGO ROJAS, et al.,)	Case No.: 1:09-cv-00705-AWI -JLT
)	
Plaintiffs,)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS
)	SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FOR FAILURE TO
v.)	COMPLY WITH THE COURT’S ORDER
)	
MARKO ZANINOVICH, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	

The Court has granted preliminary approval of the class settlement in this action, and approved the class notice plan proposed by the parties. However, the Court instructed the parties to make revisions to the proposed Class Notice to incorporate information such as the identification of the Claims Administrator and the deadlines for filing changes to the Benefit Forms, returning Exclusion Forms, or filing any opposition to the Settlement. (Doc. 268 at 17.) Therefore, the Court ordered the parties to “file a finalized Notice Packet with the required revisions for the Court’s approval no later than **March 6, 2015**.” (*Id.* at 19, emphasis in original.) To date, the parties have not complied with the Court’s order.

The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide: “Failure of counsel or of a party to comply 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.” Local Rule 110. “District courts have inherent power to control their dockets,” and in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions

1 including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831
2 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute
3 an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ferdik v.*
4 *Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order);
5 *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with
6 a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to
7 prosecute and to comply with local rules).

8 Accordingly, the parties are **ORDERED** to show cause within five days of the date of service
9 of this Order why sanctions should not be imposed for their failure to comply with the Court's order,
10 or in the alternative, file a revised Notice Packet as previously ordered by the Court.

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: March 10, 2015

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28