

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**

BRADY K. ARMSTRONG,)	Case No.: 1:12-cv-01622-LJO-SAB (PC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION
)	SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE
v.)	TO COMPLY WITH A COURT ORDER
)	
J. AGUERERRALDE, et al.,)	[ECF No. 31]
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff Brady K. Armonstrong is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On April 8, 2014, the Court found Plaintiff stated a cognizable claim for retaliation against Defendant J. Agurerralde and forwarded Plaintiff the necessary service of document forms for completion and return to the Court within thirty days. The thirty day period of time has expired and Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court’s order.

Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides, “Failure of counsel or of a party to comply with ... any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions ... within the inherent power of the Court. Local Rule 110. “District Courts have inherent power to control their dockets,” and in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions including dismissal of an action. Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action

1 or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See, e.g., *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963
2 F.2d 1258, 1260-1261 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring
3 amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal
4 for failure to comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)
5 (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules).

6 Within **fifteen (15)** days from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause in
7 writing why the instant action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with a court order.
8 Failure to comply with this order will result in dismissal of the action.

9
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: June 27, 2014



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE