

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JON C. BOBIER,
Plaintiff,
v.
UNKNOWN,
Defendant.

CASE No. 1:13-cv-00845-AWI-MJS
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY CASE
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT
ORDER
(ECF No. 15)
FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff Jon C. Bobier, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on October 3, 2012. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff has consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction. (ECF No. 13.)

On October 29, 2013, the Court issued an order striking Plaintiff's unsigned and uncaptioned Complaint and directing Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within thirty days. (ECF No. 15.) That deadline has passed without Plaintiff filing an amended complaint or requesting an extension of time to do so.

Local Rule 110 provides that "failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court." District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "in the exercise of that power, they may

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 November 29, 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 why his case should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the Court’s
14 October 29, 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, without prejudice, for failure to obey a court order and failure to prosecute.

17
18
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: December 12, 2013

/s/ Michael J. Seng
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28