

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

9 GEORGE VASQUEZ,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 EDMUND G. BROWN, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.
14

Case No. 1:10-cv-01973-DAD-JDP

ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF'S
RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION
TO DISMISS

(Doc. No. 44.)

15 Plaintiff George Vasquez is a civil detainee held at the Coalinga State Hospital (“CSH”)
16 who is proceeding pro se under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On May 29, 2018, defendants filed a motion
17 to dismiss the case and served the motion on plaintiff. (Doc. No. 44, at 32.) Plaintiff had 21
18 days from the date of service to respond to defendants’ motion to dismiss. *See* Local Rule
19 230(I). The deadline for plaintiff’s response has now passed. On May 29, 2018—rather than
20 filing a response—plaintiff filed a “notice” of certain letters that he apparently exchanged with
21 defendants’ counsel. (Doc. No. 46.) Plaintiff’s letters are not responsive to defendants’ motion
22 to dismiss. The court will allow plaintiff one more opportunity to respond to defendants’
23 motion before dismissing this case.

24 To manage its docket effectively, the court imposes deadlines on litigants and requires
25 litigants to meet those deadlines. When a plaintiff repeatedly fails to comply with court-
26 imposed deadlines, the court may dismiss the plaintiff’s case for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed.
27 R. Civ. P. 41; *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir.
28 2005) (“[T]he consensus among our sister circuits, with which we agree, is that courts may

1 dismiss under Rule 41(b) sua sponte, at least under certain circumstances.”). Involuntary
2 dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to administer justice expeditiously
3 and avoid needless burden for the parties. *See Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th
4 Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

5 The court will give plaintiff a final chance to explain why the court should not dismiss
6 the case. Plaintiff must file a response to defendants’ motion to dismiss by the deadline set
7 forth below and respond to the arguments raised by defendants in their motion to dismiss.
8 Plaintiff’s failure to respond to defendants’ motion will result in dismissal.

9 Accordingly,

- 10 1. Plaintiff George Vasquez must respond to defendants Edmund G. Brown, Pam Ahlin,
11 and Brandon Price’s motion to dismiss by Monday, July 30, 2018.
- 12 2. Defendants’ reply, if any, is due Monday, August 6, 2018.

13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: July 2, 2018

16 
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE