

1 Rasmussen; David S. Albertson; Eric Albertson; Jerry DiBuduo; and Babijuice Corporation of
2 California, Inc. *Id.* at 2-3. The defendants filed their answer to the intervenor complaint on February
3 22, 2010. (Doc. 155). Since the filing of the answer, Spectrum has not prosecuted its complaints
4 against the defendants.

5 The Ninth Circuit explained, “District courts have inherent power to control their dockets,” and
6 in exercising that power, a court may dismissal an action. *Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los*
7 *Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). Consequently, a court may dismiss an action based on a
8 party’s failure to prosecute an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local
9 rules. *See, e.g., Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure
10 to comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal,
11 in part, for failure to prosecute).

12 Accordingly, Spectrum is **ORDERED** to show cause **within five court days** of the date of
13 service of this Order why the intervening action should not be dismissed for failure prosecute its
14 claims or file a request for dismissal within this same time period.

15
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: **September 28, 2012**

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE