| 1        |   |  |  |
|----------|---|--|--|
| 2        |   |  |  |
| 3        |   |  |  |
| 4        |   |  |  |
| 5        |   |  |  |
| 6        |   |  |  |
| 7        |   |  |  |
| 8        | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |  |  |
| 9        | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |  |  |
| 10       |   |  |  |
| 11       | ANDREW B. THOMPSON,   | 1:14-cv-01521-LJO-JLT (PC)   |  |
| 12       | Plaintiff,  | ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO FILE<br>OPPOSITION OR STATEMENT OF NON- |  |
| 13       | v.  | OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION<br>FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT             |  |
| 14       | MEYER-ZLOKOVICH, et al,   | (Doc. 16)  |  |
| 15       | Defendants.   | 21-DAY DEADLINE  |  |
| 16       |   |  |  |
| 17       | Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C.                                    |  |  |
| 18       | § 1983. Plaintiff is proceeding on his claims in the Complaint against Defendants Correctional                                    |  |  |
| 19<br>20 | Officers D. Meyers, Morrows, Moreno, and A. Rocha for use of deliberate indifference to   |  |  |
| 20       | Plaintiff's safety in violation of the Eighth Amendment and for retaliation in violation of the First<br>Amendment. (Docs. 1, 9.) |  |  |
| 21       | On July 13, 2015, Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment which included notice   |  |  |
| 22<br>23 | to Plaintiff of the requirements if he desired to file an opposition. (Doc. 16.) Plaintiff has not                                |  |  |
| 23<br>24 | filed an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to the motion despite lapse of the requisite                                 |  |  |
| 25       | time. Local Rule 230( <i>l</i> ). Accordingly, the court <b>ORDERS</b> :  |  |  |
| 26       | 1. Plaintiff shall file an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to the motion  |  |  |
| 20       | within 21 days from the date of service of this order; <sup>1</sup> and   |  |  |
| 28       | <sup>1</sup> A Second Informational Order containing the requirements to oppose a motion for summary judgment issued earlier      |  |  |
|          | r second mormational order containing the require   | 1  |  |

| 1  | 2.             | Plaintiff is warned th  | at the failure to comply with this order will result              |
|----|----------------|-------------------------|---|
| 2  |                | dismissal of this actio | n, with prejudice, for failure to prosecute.                      |
| 3  |                |                         |   |
| 4  | IT IS SO OF    | RDERED.                 |   |
| 5  | Dated:         | August 21, 2015         | <u>/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston</u><br>UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE |
| 6  |                |                         |   |
| 7  |                |                         |   |
| 8  |                |                         |   |
| 9  |                |                         |   |
| 10 |                |                         |   |
| 11 |                |                         |   |
| 12 |                |                         |   |
| 13 |                |                         |   |
| 14 |                |                         |   |
| 15 |                |                         |   |
| 16 |                |                         |   |
| 17 |                |                         |   |
| 18 |                |                         |   |
| 19 |                |                         |   |
| 20 |                |                         |   |
| 21 |                |                         |   |
| 22 |                |                         |   |
| 23 |                |                         |   |
| 24 |                |                         |   |
| 25 |                |                         |   |
| 26 |                |                         |   |
| 27 |                |                         |   |
| 28 | this month. (S | lee Doc. 18.)           | 2   |