

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

DAVIND RANDOLPH SMITH,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

EDMUND G. BROWN, et al.,

 Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:13-cv-01693-MJS

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY CASE
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT
ORDER

(ECF NO. 6)

FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff David Randolph Smith, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on October 21, 2013. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff has consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction. (ECF No. 5.)

On January 30, 2014, Plaintiff’s Complaint was screened and dismissed for failure to state a cognizable claim. (ECF No. 6.) The Court granted Plaintiff thirty days leave to amend. (Id.) The resulting deadline has passed without Plaintiff having filed 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

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

10 Plaintiff has not responded to the Court’s Order requiring that he file an amended
11 complaint by not later than March 6, 2014.

12 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

13 1. Within fourteen (14) days of service of this order, Plaintiff shall either show
14 cause why his case should not be dismissed with prejudice for failure to comply with the
15 Court’s January 30, 2014 Order, or file an amended complaint; and

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

20
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: March 24, 2014

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