

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

NICOLAS MORAN,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

K. DUTRA, et al.,

 Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:11-cv-00914-LJO-MJS (PC)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR FAILURE
TO COMPLY WITH COURT ORDER

(ECF No. 68.)

FOURTEEN DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against Defendant Onwubuya on Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment inadequate medical care claim and against Defendants Dutra and Brockmeyer on his Eighth Amendment excessive force claim. (ECF No. 104.) Defendants Dutra and Brockmeyer have appeared in the action. (ECF No. 42.) The Court granted Defendant Hoggard’s motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 104.)

On April 30, 2014, the Court ordered Defendants to provide the US Marshal Service with Defendant Onwubuya’s contact information so that service could be properly effectuated. (ECF No. 68.) On May 2, 2014, Defendants filed a notice of compliance with the Court’s order. (ECF No. 69.) Defendant Onwubuya was purportedly served at the address provided by Defendants on October 30, 2014 (ECF No. 95).

Defendant Onwubuya failed to file a response or otherwise plead, and on

1 February 9, 2015, the Court ordered Defendant to show cause why default should not be
2 entered against her and ordered counsel to provide the Court with Defendant
3 Onwubuya's last known contact information so that a copy of the order may be
4 forwarded to her "at the address where service was effectuated." (ECF No. 96.)
5 Counsel for Defendants provided the Court with an out-of-state residential address.

6 Counsel, by special appearance for Defendant Onwubuya, has now filed a motion
7 to quash service on the basis that Defendant Onwubuya was improperly served at an
8 address in Folsom, California, which was provided by Defendants to the US Marshal
9 Service. (ECF No. 105.)

10 Local Rule 110 provides that "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with
11 these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of
12 any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court." "District courts have
13 inherent power to control their dockets . . . [and] [i]n the exercise of that power, they may
14 impose sanctions. . ." *Thompson v. Housing Auth.*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

15 It appearing that Defendants failed to provide current and accurate contact
16 information for Defendant Onwubuya pursuant to this Court's April 30, 2014 Order (ECF
17 No. 68.), IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 18 1. Defendants show cause, within fourteen days from the date of this order,
19 why sanctions should not be issued for failure to comply with a court order;
20 and
- 21 2. The failure to file a response to this Order will result in sanctions.

22
23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24
25 Dated: March 30, 2015

/s/ Michael J. Seng
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE