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

JOSEPHINE FLORES,

1:10-cv-00394-AWI-BAM

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF TULARE et al.,

PROSECUTE, FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT ORDERS. AND FAILURE TO

ORDER DISMISSING THE ACTION FOR FAILURE TO

ORDERS, AND FAILURE TO FILE DISPOSITIONAL DOCUMENTS

Defendants.

_____/

On December 13, 2013, this Court issued an order to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for the parties' failure to comply with this Court's order dated November 1, 2013, Plaintiff's failure to prosecute, and Plaintiff's failure to comply with Local Rules. On December 19, 2013, Plaintiff filed her response to the Court's order to show cause. Plaintiff's response explained that the settlement agreement entered into by the parties is conditioned on Plaintiff's submission of proof that the confiscated guns, the subject of this action, were legally owned by and registered to Plaintiff. Counsel for Plaintiff indicated that there have been multiple attempts by his office to secure the necessary registration and ownership information from the Department of Justice ("DOJ"). Counsel further indicated that it is his understanding that the requests are still pending.

In light of the uncertainty as to the date when the DOJ will respond to Plaintiff's request the parties came to a supplemental settlement agreement. Plaintiff indicated that the

7 8

10

9

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 16, 2014

supplemental agreement will provide that Plaintiff is to submit proof of ownership to Defendant by April 1, 2014. The parties agreed that with the execution of this agreement there is no need to maintain this action before the Court. Accordingly, on December 19, 2013, Plaintiff's Counsel agreed that he would file the settlement agreement and dispositional documents "within the next few business days." Declaration of Plaintiff's Counsel in Response to Order to Show Cause, Doc. 64 at ¶¶ 7, 8.

For the reasons discussed above, on December 19, 2014, this Court granted the parties a final extension of time to execute the supplemental settlement agreement and file a dismissal by January 6, 2014. This Court further specifically required that the parties were to explain why the case should remain open if a voluntary dismissal was not filed. Plaintiff failed to file a voluntary dismissal and failed to explain why the Court's order was disregarded.

In this Court's order granting extension to consummate the agreement the Court warned that "failure to comply with this order [would] result in dismissal of the case." Doc. 65. As articulated by this Court in its order to show cause, Plaintiff: (1) failed to prosecute this action as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), (2) failed to comply with this Court's order dated November 1, 2013, and (3) failed to file dispositional documents as required under Local Rule 160(b). Further, Plaintiff failed to comply with this Court's order dated December 19, 2013.

This Court articulated in its December 13, 2013, order to show cause the legal cause for dismissal for failure to prosecute, failure to comply with a court order, and failure file dispositional documents. Based on the reasoning articulated therein this Court shall dismiss this action with prejudice.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. This case is DISMISSED with prejudice.
- 2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close the case.

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

2