

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICHARD P. FLORES,
Plaintiff,
v.
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:14-cv-1005 DAD-BAM
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE
ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
RESPONSE DUE February 10, 2016

Plaintiff Richard P. Flores, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, seeks review of the Commissioner’s denial of his social security benefits. On July 7, 2014, this Court entered a scheduling order in this action. (Doc. 5). Pursuant to the Court’s scheduling order, Plaintiff is required to prosecute this action by either seeking voluntary remand or filing a dispositive motion within 95 days from the date of service of the administrative record by Defendant. Plaintiff was warned that failure to comply may result in dismissal of this action for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders. See Local Rule 110.

A review of the docket, including Defendant’s motion for an extension of time to file the administrative record, reflects that the administrative record was filed on October 14, 2015. (Docs. 17, 20). Plaintiff’s opening brief was therefore due no later than January 19, 2016. To date, Plaintiff has not filed his opening brief.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Accordingly, Plaintiff is HEREBY ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE why this action should not be dismissed for Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's scheduling order and Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this action. Plaintiff shall file a written response to this order to show cause no later than **February 10, 2016**. Plaintiff is forewarned that failure to respond to this order to show cause will result in the dismissal of this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 27, 2016

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE