

1 Local Rule 110 provides that “failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these
2 Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any
3 and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” District courts have the
4 inherent power to control their dockets and “in the exercise of that power, they may
5 impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal [of a case].” Thompson v.
6 Housing Auth., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based
7 on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to
8 comply with local rules. See, e.g., Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995)
9 (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-
10 61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of
11 complaint); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for
12 lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

13 Plaintiff has not responded to the Court’s Order requiring that he file an amended
14 complaint by not later than February 3, 2014.

15 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

16 1. Within fourteen (14) days of service of this order, Plaintiff shall either show
17 cause as to why his case should not be dismissed with prejudice for failure to comply
18 with the Court’s December 30, 2013 Order, or file an amended complaint; and

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

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: February 11, 2014

25 /s/ Michael J. Seng
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE