

1 impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal [of a case].” Thompson v.
2 Housing Auth., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based
3 on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to
4 comply with local rules. See, e.g., Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995)
5 (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-
6 61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of
7 complaint); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for
8 lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

9 Plaintiff has not responded to the Court’s Order requiring that he file an amended
10 complaint by not later than August 1, 2013.

11 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

12 1. Within fourteen (14) days of service of this order, Plaintiff shall either show
13 cause as to why his case should not be dismissed with prejudice for failure to comply
14 with the Court’s July 1, 2013 Order, or file an amended complaint; and

15 2. If Plaintiff fails to show cause or file an amended complaint, this action will
16 be dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to state a claim and failure to prosecute, subject
17 to the “three strikes” provision set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Silva v. Di Vittorio, 658
18 F.3d 1090 (9th Cir. 2011).

19
20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: October 29, 2013

/s/ Michael J. Seng
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE