

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GREGORY LAMONT KNOX,

1:11-cv-01598-GBC (PC)

Plaintiff,

vs.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR PLAINTIFF'S
FAILURE TO RESPOND TO THE COURT'S
ORDER REGARDING CLARIFICATION OF
PRISONER STATUS

MERCED SHERIFF DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

(Doc. 4)

/ RESPONSE DUE IN 30 DAYS

On September 21, 2011, Plaintiff filed a civil rights complaint and the mailing address indicates that he is not currently incarcerated. Doc. 1. On October 3, 2011, the Court ordered Plaintiff to clarify his correct mailing address and prisoner status in order for the Court to proceed in its consideration of Plaintiff's IFP request. Doc. 4. The thirty (30)-day period has expired, and Plaintiff has not 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 imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court." Such sanctions can include dismissal of this action. *See In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226-27 (9th Cir. 2006).

Based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that within **thirty (30) days** from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall respond to the Court's original order filed on October 3, 2011,

1 a copy of which is attached hereto, or show cause, in writing, why this action should not be
2 dismissed for Plaintiff's failure to obey a court order.

3

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5

Dated: January 3, 2012

6


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28