

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

CURTIS EPPERSON, JR.,	1:09-cv-02065-SMS (HC)
Petitioner,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
v.	SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED
	AGAINST RESPONDENT
	[Doc. 4]
JAMES D. HARTLEY,	
Respondent.	

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

Petitioner filed the petition for writ of habeas corpus on November 16, 2009. On December 15, 2009, the Court directed Respondent to file a response within sixty days from the date of service of that order. Over sixty days have passed and Respondent has failed to file a response. Review of the certificate of service reveals that Respondent was served with this order at the appropriate address.

Local Rule 110 provides that “a failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Local Rules or 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.”

///
///

1 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED within twenty (20) days of service of this order,
2 to SHOW CAUSE why appropriate sanctions should not be imposed for failing to obey a court
3 order.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 **Dated: March 1, 2010**

/s/ Sandra M. Snyder
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28