UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

J & J SPORTS PRODUCTIONS, INC ,) Case No.: 1:14-cv-01578-KJM-BAM
Plaintiff, v.	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE TO DEFENDANT MARTIN CARRILLO MARTINEZ WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED INCLUDING ENTRY OF DEFAULT
MARTIN CARRILLO MARTINEZ a/k/a MARTIN MARTINEZ CARRILLO,) ORDER SETTING SHOW CAUSE HEARING)
Defendant.	HEARING: Monday, March 7, 2016 at 2:00PM in Dept. 8

TO DEFENDANT MARTIN CARRILLO MARTINEZ:

Defendant Martin Carrillo Martinez aka Martin Martinez Carrillo is proceeding *pro se* in this action. Defendant failed to appear at the Mandatory Scheduling Conference on February 7, 2016. Previously, on January 14, 2016, plaintiff and defendant were advised electronically and by mail that a scheduling conference would be held on February 17, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. (Doc. 28). In the interim, on February 11, 2016, the Court issued a minute order warning the parties that failure to appear at the scheduling conference, either personally or by telephone, may result in sanctions. On February 17, 2016, counsel for Plaintiff appeared at the scheduling conference, however, Defendant failed to appear. Without Defendant's appearance, the scheduling conference could not proceed.

At the hearing, Plaintiff's counsel also advised the Court that Defendant failed to participate in the joint scheduling report. Plaintiff's counsel further explained that he has made several unsuccessful attempts to reach Defendant by mail and by phone. On a most recent attempt, a person answering

defendant's listed telephone number responded that Plaintiff has the wrong number. Defendant is under a duty to keep the Court and counsel apprised of his current contact information. Local Rule 183. The Court needs to have information regarding Defendant's contact information as it will affect the management of this litigation.

Accordingly, Defendant SHALL show cause why he has failed to participate in these proceedings and obey the orders of this Court and why sanctions, up to an including terminating sanctions, should not be imposed for his failure to update his contact information and appear at the Court's scheduling conference. Defendant is further put on notice that failure to timely respond, as explained in this order, may result in the imposition of sanctions.

DISCUSSION

Eastern District of California Local Rule 182(f) provides that attorneys and any party appearing pro se are "under a continuing duty to notify the Clerk and all other parties of any change of address or telephone number of the attorney or the pro se party." Thus, Defendant is under a continuing duty to keep the Clerk and others informed of any change to his address or telephone number.

Local Rule 110 provides that "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court." District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "in the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal of a case." *Thompson v. Housing Auth.*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d

On July 10, 2015, Defendant submitted a letter to the Court with his current address and telephone number. (Doc. 21).

128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules). In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS the following:

- 1. Defendant MARTIN CARRILLO MARTINEZ is hereby ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE why this Court should not impose sanctions, including default or dismissal, for his failure to appear at the telephonic scheduling conference and otherwise comply with Local Rule 182(f). Defendant shall respond to this Order to Show Cause, in writing, no later than February 29, 2016;
- 2. Defendant's written statement **SHALL** identify his current physical address, telephone number, and email address, if any. If his contact information has changed, he shall explain why he failed to keep the Court apprised of his contact information. He shall also advise the Court whether he intends to continue to defend this action;
- 3. The Court also **SETS** a Show Cause Hearing for **March 7, 2016 at 2:00 PM** in Courtroom 8 (BAM) before United States Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe. Defendant may appear by telephone by contacting Plaintiff at telephone number (626)799-979 prior to the conference;
 - 4. Plaintiff SHALL appear at the show cause hearing by telephone;
- 5. The Clerk of the Court is directed to serve this Order to Show Cause on Defendant by mail.

The failure to respond to this order or failure to appear at the March 7 hearing <u>will</u> result in the imposition of sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 17, 2016

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE