

1 The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide: “Failure of counsel or of a
2 party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any
3 and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” Local Rule 110. “District courts have
4 inherent power to control their dockets,” and in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions.
5 *Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may issue
6 sanctions based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or failure to comply with local rules. *See*,
7 *e.g. Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with
8 an order); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to
9 comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for
10 failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules).

11 Accordingly, Defendants are **ORDERED** to show cause within 14 days of the date of service
12 of this Order why sanctions should not be imposed for failure comply with the Court’s order and
13 failure to comply with Local Rule 180(g), or in the alternative, to file an amended substitution of
14 counsel.

15
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: June 11, 2013

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE