1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SCOTT RANKIN, Case No. 1:14-cv-854-BAM 11 12 Plaintiff, ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO FILE OPENING BRIEF WITHIN TWENTY-ONE 13 DAYS v. 14 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, 15 Defendant. 16 Plaintiff Scott Rankin ("Plaintiff"), proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, initiated this 17 action on June 5, 2014, seeking review of the Commissioner's denial of his social security 18 benefits. (Doc. 1). 19 On June 4, 2015, following service of the complaint, the Court issued a Scheduling 20 Order. The order required Plaintiff to prosecute this action by seeking voluntary remand or filing 21 a dipositive motion within 95 days from service of the administrative record. (Docs. 14, 19). 22 Defendant filed the administrative record in this action on July 24, 2015. (Doc. 15). However, 23 Plaintiff did not file a timely opening brief. As a result, on April 7, 2016, this Court ordered 24 Plaintiff to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for Plaintiff's failure to comply 25

with the Court's scheduling order and Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this action. (Doc. 16). After

Plaintiff filed his response on April 15, 2016, the Court discharged the Order to Show Cause and

ordered Plaintiff to file his opening brief on or before June 22, 2016.

26

27

28

To date, Plaintiff has again failed to file his opening brief—making his opening brief over eight months late. Plaintiff was forewarned that his failure to file an Opening Brief in compliance with the Court's Order would result in dismissal of this action for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders. See Local Rule 110. However, because Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the Court will give Plaintiff a final extension of time to file his opening brief in this action.

Accordingly, Plaintiff is HEREBY ORDERED to file an opening brief within twenty-one (21) days or on or before July 27, 2016. Plaintiff is expressly warned that his failure to timely file his Opening Brief will be deemed consent to the dismissal without prejudice of this action for failure to comply with a court order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: **July 6, 2016**

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE