UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

) Case No.: 1:13-cv-00570 – LJO – JLT (PC)
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR
) PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE
) COURT'S ORDER
) (Doc. 13).
))

Plaintiff is a prisoner proceeding *pro se* in an action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court dismissed Plaintiff's second amended complaint on August 26, 2013, but granted Plaintiff leave to file a third amended complaint within 21 days. (Doc. 13). More than 21 days have passed, and Plaintiff has failed to file a third amended complaint.

The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide, "[f]ailure 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. Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

Plaintiff is advised that this will be the Court's FINAL order for Plaintiff to file a third amended complaint within 14 days of the date of service of this Order. Failure to do so will result in an immediate finding and recommendation of dismissal for failure to prosecute. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **September 19, 2013** /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE