

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

TERRANCE HEMPHILL,

CASE NO. 1:12-cv-00630-GBC

Plaintiff,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE
PETITIONER’S FAILURE TO RESPOND TO
THE COURT’S ORDER REGARDING
PAYMENT OF FILING FEE OR
PROCEEDING IN FORMA PAUPERIS

v.

MATTHEW CATE, et al,

Defendants.

(Doc. 4)

/ RESPONSE DUE IN 30 DAYS

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed this civil action on April 20, 2011. Doc. 1. Plaintiff filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis, however, the application lacked the requisite authorization to withdraw funds from his trust account. Doc. 2. On April 25, 2012, the Court ordered Plaintiff to submit a corrected application to proceed in forma pauperis and do so within forty-five days. (Doc. 4). More than forty-five days have passed and Plaintiff has not complied with or otherwise responded to the Court’s order. Plaintiff was warned that failure to obey the order would result in dismissal of the action.

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).

///

1 Based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that within **thirty (30) days** from the date
2 of service of this order, petitioner shall pay the \$350.00 filing fee in full or file an application to
3 proceed in forma pauperis, a copy of which is attached hereto, or show cause, in writing, why
4 sanctions should not be imposed for petitioner's failure to obey a court order.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: July 3, 2012

8 
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE