UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

COLUMBUS ALLEN, JR.) Case No.: 1:13-cv-00012-AWI-SAB (PC)
Plaintiff, v. STANISLAUS COUNTY, et al., Defendants.	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE [ECF Nos. 22, 27]

Plaintiff Columbus Allen, Jr. is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On July 29, 2014, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the complaint. The motion was served by mail on Plaintiff at his address of record. In accordance with Local Rule 230(1), Plaintiff had up to and including August 22, 2014, to file an opposition to the motion. To date, Plaintiff has not responded to Defendants' motion. On September 2, 2014, Defendants filed a reply for failure of Plaintiff to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to their motion to dismiss. Local Rule 230(1) of which this action is proceeding specifically states:

A responding party who has no opposition to the granting of the motion shall serve and file a statement to that effect, specifically designating the motion in question. Failure of the responding party to file an opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion and may result in the imposition of sanctions.

Pursuant to Local Rule 230(1), Plaintiff is HEREBY ORDERED to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for failure to an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to Defendants' motion within thirty (30) days. Plaintiff is warned that the failure to comply with this order will result in dismissal of the action for failure to prosecute.

5 ||

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 24, 2014

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

1. 5