

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

MARISOL FLORES,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

) 1:10cv02004 DLB

) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

) ORDER DIRECTING CLERK TO SERVE
) PLAINTIFF AT ALTERNATE ADDRESS

On October 22, 2010, Plaintiff filed the present action for judicial review of the denial of Social Security benefits. On October 25, 2010, the Court issued a Scheduling Order. The Scheduling Order states that within 120 days after service, Defendant shall file and serve a copy of the administrative record, which shall be deemed an answer to the complaint. The Order also provides that within 30 days after service of the administrative record, Plaintiff shall serve on Defendant a letter brief outlining why remand is warranted. Defendant shall respond to the letter within 35 days. Thereafter, if Defendant does not stipulate to remand, Plaintiff must file and serve an opening brief within 30 days of Defendant's response.

On February 28, 2011, Defendant filed the administrative record. On June 2, 2011, the Court granted attorney Lawrence D. Rohlfing's Motion to Withdraw as Attorney of Record for Plaintiff and substituted Plaintiff pro se. The dates in the Scheduling Order were extended 45 days. Plaintiff's opening brief was to be filed on or before July 21, 2011.

1 Plaintiff failed to file her opening brief. On August 8, 2011, the Court issued an Order to
2 Show Cause why the action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the Court's
3 Scheduling Order And the Court's June 2, 2011, order. The Court has attempted service on
4 Plaintiff twice, but the order has been returned both times by the United States Postal Service as
5 undeliverable.

6 Upon review of the Motion to Withdraw, it appears that Mr. Rohlring may have provided
7 an incorrect street name. He lists Plaintiff's address as 605 N. *Popular* Avenue, Fresno,
8 California, 93728.¹ It is likely that the address is 605 N. *Poplar* Avenue, Fresno, California,
9 93728.

10 Accordingly, Plaintiff is ordered to show cause, if any she has, why this action should not
11 be dismissed for failure to comply with the Scheduling Order and the Court's June 2, 2011 order.
12 Plaintiff is ORDERED to file a written response to this Order to Show Cause WITHIN **twenty**
13 **(20) days** of the date of this Order. If Plaintiff desires more time to file her brief, she should so
14 state in her response. **Failure to respond to this Order to Show Cause will result in dismissal**
15 **of this action.**

16 To ensure that the Court has made every possible attempt to notify Plaintiff of the status
17 of this action, the Court DIRECTS the Clerk of Court to serve Plaintiff at **605 N. Poplar**
18 **Avenue, Fresno, California, 93728.**

19
20
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: September 1, 2011

/s/ Dennis L. Beck
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

24
25
26
27 _____
28 ¹ For an unknown reason, the docket reflects an address of 6052 N. Popular Avenue, Fresno, California,
93728. Re-service was also attempted at this address and failed as "undeliverable, return to sender, insufficient
address, unable to forward."