

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

<p>MANUEL CARDENAS,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>NEIL ADLER,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>1:09-cv-01793 LJO MJS HC</p> <p>ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FOR FAILING TO COMPLY WITH A COURT ORDER [Doc. 6.]</p> <p>ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO SERVE ORDER ON UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE</p>
--	---	---

Petitioner is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se with a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

On July 15, 2010, an order directing Respondent to file a response to the petition was issued in this case and Respondent was directed to file a response to the petition within sixty (60) days. (ECF No. 6.) Respondent also was directed to file a notice of appearance within twenty (20) days of the date of service of the order. (Id.) Finally, Respondent was ordered to file a consent to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction form with the Court within (30) thirty days of July 15, 2010. (ECF No. 7.)

As of this date, over sixty (60) days have passed and the Court has not received a response, a notice of appearance, or a consent to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction form from Respondent.

Local Rule 110 provides: "Failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all

1 sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.”

2 Accordingly, Respondent is HEREBY ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE , within thirty (30)
3 days of service of this order, why appropriate sanctions should not be imposed for failing to
4 comply with a court order.

5

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: October 7, 2010

/s/ Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28