UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROGRIGO DE CASES,	CASE NO. 1:11-cv-1813–MJS (PC)
Plaintiff, v. THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY CASE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT ORDER
HEALTH, et al.,	(ECF No. 6)
Defendants.	PLAINTIFF MUST SHOW CAUSE BY JUNE 5, 2012

Plaintiff Rogrigo De Cases ("Plaintiff") is a civil detainee proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction. (ECF No. 4.)

On March 28, 2012, the Court issued an Order, directing Plaintiff to produce a copy of any final order and judgment issued in the case <u>In re Rodrigo De Casas</u>, 10CRWR680131, or if none was available, to submit a short description regarding the status of the state action. (ECF No. 6.) Plaintiff was given thirty days in which to comply with this order. (<u>Id.</u>) Thirty days have passed without Plaintiff complying with or otherwise responding to the Court's Order.

Local Rule 110 provides that "failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these 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." District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "in the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal of a case." Thompson v. Housing Auth., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See, e.g., Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

Plaintiff has not responded to the Court's March 28, 2012, Order. He will be given one more opportunity, until June 5, 2012, and no later, to produce a copy of any final order and judgment issued in the case In re Rodrigo De Casas, 10CRWR680131, or if none is available, to submit a short description regarding the status of the state action. In the alternative. Plaintiff may show cause why his case should not be dismissed for failure to comply with a Court order. Failure to meet this deadline will result in dismissal of this action.

18

23

24

25

26

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated:

May 21, 2012

27 28