## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KAREN HARRIS,	) Case No.: 1:12-cv-01664 - LJO - JLT
Plaintiff, v.  BEAR VALLEY COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT, et al.,	ORDER TO PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S ORDER  O
Defendants.	) ) )

Karen Harris ("Plaintiff") initiated this action by filing a complaint on October 11, 2012. (Doc. 1). The same day, the Court issued civil case documents and an Order Setting Mandatory Scheduling Conference. (Doc. 5). The Court explained a scheduling conference could not be held until the defendants were served with the summons and complaint. *Id.* at 1. Therefore, the Court instructed: "plaintiff[] shall diligently pursue service of summons and complaint . . ." *Id.* Further, Plaintiff was directed to "file proofs of service of the summons and complaint so the Court has a record of service." *Id.* at 1-2. Although summons were issued on October 11, 2012 (Docs. 3-4), Plaintiff has not filed proof of service.

The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide: "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." LR 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 based upon a party's failure to obey a court order, failure to prosecute an action, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order).

Accordingly, Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to show cause within fourteen days of the date of service of this Order why the action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to follow the Court's Order, or in the alternative, to file a proof of service indicating the defendants have been served with the documents required by the Court's order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 4, 2013 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE