1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
<u>6</u>			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10		Coop No. 1:14 ov 00914 LIO MIS (DC)	
11	EDWARD T. FURNACE,	Case No. 1:14-cv-00814-LJO-MJS (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO FILE OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'	
13	v. CONNIE GIPSON, et al.,	MOTION TO DISMISS	
14	CONNE OF SON, et al.,	(ECF No. 51)	
	Defendants		
15	Defendants.	TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE	
15 16	Defendants.		
16 17	Defendants.		
16 17 18			
16 17 18 19		TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE	
16 17 18	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceedin	<b>TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE</b> g pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil § 1983. The action proceeds on Plaintiff's	
16 17 18 19	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceedin rights action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C.	<b>TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE</b> g pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil § 1983. The action proceeds on Plaintiff's ts Connie Gipson, Kimbrell, Swift, Allen,	
16 17 18 19 20	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceedin rights action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. First Amendment claim against Defendan Robicheaux, Graves, and Sexton. (ECF No.	<b>TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE</b> g pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil § 1983. The action proceeds on Plaintiff's ts Connie Gipson, Kimbrell, Swift, Allen,	
16 17 18 19 20 21	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceedin rights action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. First Amendment claim against Defendan Robicheaux, Graves, and Sexton. (ECF No.	TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE g pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil § 1983. The action proceeds on Plaintiff's ts Connie Gipson, Kimbrell, Swift, Allen, 16.) led a motion to dismiss for failure to state a	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceedin rights action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. First Amendment claim against Defendan Robicheaux, Graves, and Sexton. (ECF No. On February 26, 2016, Defendants fi	<b>TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE</b> g pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil § 1983. The action proceeds on Plaintiff's ts Connie Gipson, Kimbrell, Swift, Allen, 16.) led a motion to dismiss for failure to state a n opposition or statement of non-opposition	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceedin rights action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. First Amendment claim against Defendan Robicheaux, Graves, and Sexton. (ECF No. On February 26, 2016, Defendants fi claim. (ECF No. 51.) Plaintiff has not filed a	TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE g pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil § 1983. The action proceeds on Plaintiff's ts Connie Gipson, Kimbrell, Swift, Allen, 16.) led a motion to dismiss for failure to state a n opposition or statement of non-opposition ing so has passed. Local Rule 230( <i>l</i> ). The	
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceedin rights action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. First Amendment claim against Defendan Robicheaux, Graves, and Sexton. (ECF No. On February 26, 2016, Defendants fi claim. (ECF No. 51.) Plaintiff has not filed a to Defendant's motion, and the time for do	TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE g pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil § 1983. The action proceeds on Plaintiff's ts Connie Gipson, Kimbrell, Swift, Allen, 16.) led a motion to dismiss for failure to state a n opposition or statement of non-opposition ing so has passed. Local Rule 230( <i>l</i> ). The hity to respond to the motion: <u>Plaintiff must</u>	
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ol>	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceedin rights action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. First Amendment claim against Defendan Robicheaux, Graves, and Sexton. (ECF No. On February 26, 2016, Defendants fi claim. (ECF No. 51.) Plaintiff has not filed a to Defendant's motion, and the time for do Court will give Plaintiff one further opportur	TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE g pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil § 1983. The action proceeds on Plaintiff's ts Connie Gipson, Kimbrell, Swift, Allen, 16.) led a motion to dismiss for failure to state a n opposition or statement of non-opposition ing so has passed. Local Rule 230( <i>l</i> ). The hity to respond to the motion: <u>Plaintiff must</u> position to Defendants' motion to dismiss	

1	an oppositi	on or a statement	of non-opposition to the motion this action may be		
2	an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to the motion, this action may be dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to prosecute and failure to obey a court order.				
2	distriissed,				
4	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
5					
6	Dated:	April 4, 2016	<u>Isl Michael J. Seng</u> UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
7			UNITED STATES MADISTRATE SUDDE		
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28			2		
			2		