1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
8				
9	THORNELL BROWN,	CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00792-LJO-GBC (PC)		
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO FILE OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION		
11	V.	FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (Doc. 58)		
12	R. J. WILLIAMS, et al.,	TWENTY-DAY DEADLINE		
13	Defendants.			
14		,		
15				
16	I. Procedural History			
17	Plaintiff Thornell Brown ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding in forma pauperis ("IFP")			
18	in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding on Plaintiff's			
19	complaint, filed May 4, 2009, against Defendants Williams and Gonzales ("Defendants") for use of			
20	excessive force and subjecting Plaintiff to unconstitutional conditions of confinement following the			
21	use of force on May 23, 2005, in violation of the Eighth Amendment. Doc. 1 (Complaint); Doc. 8			
22	(Cog. Claim Ord.).			
23	On March 29, 2012, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. Doc. 58. As			
24	explained in the Court's second informational order filed on January 12, 2010 (Doc. 10-1), Plaintiff			
25	was required to file an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to the motion within twenty-one			
26	days, but has not done so. Local Rule 78-230(m). As warned in its January 12, 2010, order: "the			
27	Court may consider plaintiffs failure to act as a waiver of opposition to defendant(s) motion.			
28	Plaintiff's waiver of opposition to defendant(s)' motion may result in the entry of summary judgment			
		1		

1	against plaintiff."	Doc. 10-1.
---	---------------------	------------

Accordingly, within **twenty (20) days** from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff must file an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to the Defendants' motion for summary judgment or the case will be dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 25, 2012

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE