| ommissioner of Social Security | | Doc. 20 |
|--|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| IN THE UNITED STA | ATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE | |
| EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| MICHAEL IACKSON |) 1.10cv2/18 DI B | |
| WICHAEL JACKSON, |) 1.10CV2418 DLB) | |
| |) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| VS. | | |
| COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY. | | |
| SECORT 1, | | |
| Defendant. | | |
| Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this a | ction for judicial review of the denial of Social Secu | rity |
| benefits, filed on December 30, 2010. Also on December 30, 2010, the Court issued a Scheduling | | |
| Order. The Scheduling Order states that wi | thin 120 days after service, Defendant shall file and s | erve |
| a copy of the administrative record, which sl | hall be deemed an answer to the complaint. The Ord | ler |
| 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 which Defendant shall respond to within | | |
| 35 days. Thereafter, if Defendant does not s | stipulate to remand, within 30 days of Defendant's | |
| response, Plaintiff must file and serve an ope | ening brief. | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | 1 | |
| | | |
| | Dockets | luatia al |
| | IN THE UNITED STAE EASTERN DI MICHAEL JACKSON, Plaintiff, vs. COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, Defendant. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this a benefits, filed on December 30, 2010. Also Order. The Scheduling Order states that wi a copy of the administrative record, which s also provides that within 30 days after service Defendant a letter brief outlining why remand 35 days. Thereafter, if Defendant does not service. | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MICHAEL JACKSON, 1:10ev2418 DLB Plaintiff, vs. COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, Defendant. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this action for judicial review of the denial of Social Secure benefits, filed on December 30, 2010. Also on December 30, 2010, the Court issued a Schedulin Order. The Scheduling Order states that within 120 days after service, Defendant shall file and s a copy of the administrative record, which shall be deemed an answer to the complaint. The Ord 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 which Defendant shall respond to with 35 days. Thereafter, if Defendant does not stipulate to remand, within 30 days of Defendant's response, Plaintiff must file and serve an opening brief. |

On May 11, 2011, Defendant lodged the administrative record. Pursuant to the Scheduling Order, Plaintiff was required to file his brief on or before August 17, 2011. However, on August 8, 2011, the Court granted Plaintiff's substitution of attorney and Plaintiff was substituted in pro se. As it was counsel's responsibility to inform Plaintiff of the upcoming dates upon withdrawal, the Court did not extend deadlines. Plaintiff has not filed his opening brief and has not otherwise communicated with the Court. Therefore, Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, if any he has, why the action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the Court's orders. Plaintiff is ORDERED to file a written response to this Order to Show Cause within twenty (20) days of the date of this Order. If Plaintiff desires more time to file his brief or wishes to dismiss this action, he should so state in his response. Failure to respond to this Order to Show Cause will result in dismissal of this action. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: September 8, 2011 <u>/s/ Dennis L. Beck</u> UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE