

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

TONY HALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

MATTHEW CATE,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:10-cv-01601-SMS PC

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AS TO WHY
ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH A COURT
ORDER

(ECF No. 8)

RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
DUE WITHIN THIRTY DAYS

Plaintiff Tony Hall (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On September 7, 2010, the Court ordered Plaintiff to submit a signed application to proceed in forma pauperis or pay the filing fee within thirty days. More than thirty days have passed, and Plaintiff has not complied with or otherwise responded to the Court’s order.

Local Rule 110 provides that “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.” Further, the failure of Plaintiff to prosecute this action is grounds for dismissal. In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006).

Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that within **thirty (30) days** from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause in writing why this action should not be dismissed for failure to obey a court order.

///

