1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6 7			
7 8	IINITED STATE	S DISTDICT COUDT	
8 9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9 10	EASTERN DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	CHARLES F. ROBERTSON,	Case No. 1:14-cv-00364-SAB	
11	Plaintiff,	Case No. 1.14-CV-00504-SAD	
12	v.	ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS ACTION SHOULD NOT BE	
13	JOHN DOE, et al.,	DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT ORDER	
15	Defendants.	FOURTEEN DAY DEADLINE	
16			
17	Plaintiff Charles F. Robertson filed this action on March 14, 2014. (ECF No. 1.) On		
18	December 22, 2014, Plaintiff's second amended complaint was screened and Plaintiff was		
19	ordered to either file an amended complaint or notify the Court that he was willing to proceed on		
20	the claims found to be cognizable within thirty days. (ECF No. 17.) On January 23, 2015, the		
21	action was stayed pending resolution of motions to dismiss in the related cases of Jackson v.		
22	California, No. 1:13-cv-01055-LJO-SAB, and Smith v. Schwarzenegger, No. 1:14-cv-00060-		
23	LJO-SAB. On October 19, 2015, the stay was lifted and Plaintiff was ordered to file an amended		
24	complaint or notify the Court of his willingness to proceed on the claims found to be cognizable		
25	in the December 22, 2014 screening order within fourteen days. More than fourteen days have		
26	passed and Plaintiff has not complied with or otherwise responded to the December 22, 2014		
27	order.		
28	Local Rule 110 provides that "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules		

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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." The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action. <u>Bautista v. Los Angeles County</u> , 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000). Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE within fourteen (14) days of the date of entry of this order why this action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the October 19, 2015 order. Plaintiff is forewarned that the failure to		
9 10	show cause will result in dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute.		
11 12	IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: December 2, 2015		
13	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
14			
15			
16 17			
17			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24 25			
23 26			
27			
28	2		