1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	COLUMBUS ALLEN, JR.) Case No.: 1:13-cv-00012-DAD-SAB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE WITHIN TEN (10) DAYS WHY TERMINATING SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S SCHEDULING ORDER
13	v.	
14	STANISLAUS COUNTY, et al.,	
15	Defendants.) (Doc. No. 84)
16		_)
17	Plaintiff Columbus Allen, Jr. is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights	
18	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
19	This action is proceeding against Defendants County of Stanislaus, Puthuff, Christianson,	
20	Captain Duncan, and Lieutenant Lloyd for denial of outdoor exercise, against Defendants Lieutenant	
21	Suarez, Sergeant Galles, Sergeant Truffa, Mauldin, Meyers, and Williams for a due process violation	
22	for denial of access to telephone privileges, against Defendants Lieutenant Suarez, Lieutenant Clifton,	
23	Sergeant Truffa, Sergeant Radza, Williams, Aziz, Maze, and Cardoza for failure to protect, and agains	
24	Defendants Lieutenant Clifton, Sergeant Radza, and Cardoza for retaliation.	
25	///	
26	///	
27	///	
28	///	

On March 30, 2017, the Court issued the Second Scheduling Order, which required Plaintiff to serve and file a pretrial statement on or before May 31, 2017. (Doc. No. 84.) Plaintiff failed to comply with the Court's order to file a pretrial statement.¹

Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Within **ten** (**10**) **days** from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause why this action should not be dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to obey the Court's order and Local Rules and for failure to prosecute this action;
- 2. <u>Plaintiff is warned that the failure to respond to this order or to show good cause</u> will result in dismissal of this action, with prejudice; and
- 3. The deadline for Defendants to file their pretrial statement is extended to **July 10, 2017**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **June 15, 2017**

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

On May 30, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's May 16, 2017, denying his request for appointment of counsel. This filing contains no mention of Plaintiff's filing of a pretrial statement. (ECF No. 87.)