1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	EASTERN DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
8		
9	RENO FUENTES RIOS,	1:12-cv-01334-LJO-SKO (PC)
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR
11	v.	PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S ORDER AND FOR FAILURE
12	GIPSON, et al.,	TO PROSECUTE
13	Defendants.	(Docs. 65, 66)
14		30 DAY DEADLINE
15	Plaintiff Rano Rios is a state prisone	or proceeding pro seand in forma nauparis in this
16	Plaintiff, Reno Rios, is a state prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> and <i>in forma pauperis</i> in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On November 1, 2016, Defendants filed a	
17		ederal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 asserting Plaintiff's
18		ior to filing suit. (Doc. 65.) On November 2, 2016,
19		ng Plaintiff of the requirements for opposing a
20		in opposition or a statement of non-opposition.
21	(Doc. 66.) Plaintiff was also ordered to file his responsive document within twenty-one (21)	
22	days. (Doc. 66.) More than thirty days have passed without Plaintiff having filed a pleading.	
23	The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide, "[f]ailure of counsel or	
24 25	of a party to comply with any order of the	e Court may be grounds for the imposition by the
25 26	Court of any and all sanctions within the inherent power of the Court." Local Rule 110.	
26 27	"District courts have inherent power to control their dockets," and in exercising that power, a	
27	court may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. Thompson v. Housing Authority of	
28		1

1	Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice,
2	based on a party's failure to prosecute an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to
3	comply with local rules. See, e.g. Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)
4	(dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); Malone v. U.S.
5	Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court
6	order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to
7	prosecute and to comply with local rules).
8	Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause within thirty (30) days of the date of
9	service of this Order why the action should not be dismissed for his failure comply with the
10	Court's order and for his failure to prosecute this action. Alternatively within that same time,
11	Plaintiff may file an opposition or statement of non-opposition.
12	
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.
14	Dated: December 2, 2016 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
15	
15 16	
16	
16 17	
16 17 18	
16 17 18 19	
16 17 18 19 20	
16 17 18 19 20 21	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	2