

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**

JESUS DIAZ,	)	Case No.: 1:13-cv-01001-BAM
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW
	)	CAUSE WHY THIS ACTION SHOULD NOT BE
v.	)	DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE
	)	AND FAILURE TO OBEY COURT RULES
COUNTY OF FRESNO,	)	
	)	<b>FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE</b>
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Jesus Diaz (“Plaintiff”) is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil action under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.* Plaintiff, through counsel, initiated this action on June 28, 2013. The parties have consented to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge. (Docs. 12, 13.)

On October 31, 2016, the Court granted leave of Plaintiff’s counsel to withdraw as attorneys of record in this matter, and substituted Plaintiff as counsel in propria persona. The Court granted withdrawal based on Plaintiff’s failure to provide counsel with his current address and phone number, and on the inability of counsel to contact Plaintiff for several years. (Doc. 54.) The Court’s order was served on Plaintiff at his last known address. On January 23, 2017, that order was returned by the United States Post Office as Undeliverable, RTS, Unknown, Illegible, Unable to Forward. To date, Plaintiff has not provided the Court with his current address or contact information.

1 Pursuant to Local Rules 182 and 183, a pro se party is under a continuing duty to notify the  
2 Clerk, the Court and all other parties of any change of address or telephone number. Local Rule  
3 182(f), 183(b). Additionally, Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure . . . of a party to comply with  
4 these [Local] Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any  
5 and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” Further, the failure of Plaintiff to  
6 prosecute this action is grounds for dismissal. In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability  
7 Litigation, 460 F.3d 1217, 1227 (9th Cir. 2006) (“Rule 41(b) permits dismissal for failure of the  
8 plaintiff to prosecute or to comply with any order of court”).

9 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that, within **fourteen (14) days** from the date of  
10 service of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause in writing why this action should not be dismissed for  
11 failure to prosecute and failure to obey a court order. Plaintiff may comply with this order by notifying  
12 the Court in writing of his current address and telephone number. **Plaintiff’s failure to respond to**  
13 **this order will result in dismissal of this action without further notice.**

14  
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16  
17 Dated: April 4, 2017

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE