

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTHONY ANDERSON, Case No. 1:09-cv-01029 JLT (PC)

Plaintiff, **ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS
vs. ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE**

A. HEDGPETH, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis* with a civil rights action pursuant to 42

U.S.C. § 1983. By order filed November 8, 2010, the Court directed Plaintiff to, within thirty days, file an amended complaint curing the deficiencies in his pleadings as identified by the Court in its screening order. (Doc. 12.) The Court also warned Plaintiff that failure to comply with the Court's order would result in the dismissal of the case. (Id.)

On November 29, 2010, Plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time to comply with the Court's November 8, 2010 order. (Doc. 13.) The Court granted Plaintiff's motion on December 7, 2010, and Plaintiff was afforded sixty additional days to comply with the Court's screening order. (Doc. 16.) The sixty day period has since expired, and Plaintiff has failed to file an amended complaint or otherwise respond to the Court's November 8, 2010 screening order.

Accordingly, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that within twenty-one (21) days from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause in writing why this action should not be dismissed

1 for his failure to prosecute this case. If Plaintiff wishes to proceed with this action, he must also file
2 an amended complaint in accordance with the Court's November 8, 2010 screening order. Plaintiff
3 is firmly cautioned that failure to comply with this order will result in the dismissal of this action.

4

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: February 14, 2011

7 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28