1			
1 2			
2			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	ARCHIE CRANFORD,	Case No. 1:14-cv-00910-JLT (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED	
13	v.	FOR PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S ORDER	
14	PROWN,	(Docs. 1, 10, 13)	
15	Defendant.	30-DAY DEADLINE	
16	Plaintiff Archie Cranford is a sixil datained proceeding pro so and in forms poweris in		
17	Plaintiff, Archie Cranford, is a civil detainee proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed this action on June 13, 2014. (Doc.		
18	 1.) The Court screened the Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and found that it states a 		
19 20	cognizable claim for relief under section 1983 against Defendant Brown (erroneously sued herein		
20 21	as Jessica Prown) for excessive force and deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's serious medical		
21	needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment. (Doc. 8.) Defendant filed a motion for order		
23	requiring Plaintiff to provide a more definite statement of his claim(s) he intends to pursue in the		
24	Complaint to assist in fully understanding Plainti	iff's allegations against her in this action. (Docs.	
25	10.) On October 31, 2014, an order issued grant	ing Defendant's motion and ordering Plaintiff to	
26	file a first amended complaint within thirty days.	(Doc. 13.) More than thirty days have passed	
27	and Plaintiff has failed to file an amended complaint or otherwise respond to the Court's Order.		
28	The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed	I. R. Civ. P. 11, provide, "[f]ailure of counsel or	

1	of a party to comply with any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the	
2	Court of any and all sanctions within the inherent power of the Court." Local Rule 110.	
3	"District courts have inherent power to control their dockets," and in exercising that power, a	
4	court may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. Thompson v. Housing Authority of	
5	Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice,	
6	based on a party's failure to prosecute an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to	
7	comply with local rules. See, e.g. Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)	
8	(dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); Malone v. U.S.	
9	Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court	
10	order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to	
11	prosecute and to comply with local rules).	
12	Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause in writing within 30 days of the date	
13	of service of this Order why the action should not be dismissed for his failure comply with the	
14	Court's order.	
15		
16	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
17	Dated: December 11, 2014 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston	
	Dated: December 11, 2014 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
17		
17 18		
17 18 19		
17 18 19 20		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 		
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 		