

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, by not later than
11 October 25, 2014, he file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his willingness to
12 proceed on his cognizable claims.

13 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

14 1. Within thirty (30) days of service of this order, Plaintiff shall either show
15 cause as to why his case should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the Court’s
16 September 25, 2014 Order, file an amended complaint, or notify the Court of his
17 willingness to proceed on his cognizable claims; and

18 2. If Plaintiff fails to show cause or otherwise respond as directed, this action
19 will be dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to comply with a court order.

20
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: November 17, 2014

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