



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

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

18  
19  
20  
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: May 21, 2012

*Isl. Michael J. Seng*  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE