

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**

THERESA MARIE BRASSFIELD,	)	Case No.: 1:14-cv-01684 - --- - JLT
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER TO PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
	)	THE ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
v.	)	FOR HER FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND
	)	FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT’S
CAROLYN W. COLVIN,	)	ORDER
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Theresa Marie Brassfield initiated this action by filing a complaint on October 27, 2014, seeking judicial review of the administrative decision denying her application for Social Security benefits. (Doc. 1.) On November 4, 2014, the Court determined Plaintiff failed to allege facts sufficient for the Court to determine the matter of its jurisdiction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). (Doc. 3). Plaintiff was ordered to file an amended complaint within thirty days of the date of service, or no later than December 4, 2014. (*Id.* at 4). To date, Plaintiff has failed to comply with or otherwise respond to the Court’s order.

The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide: “Failure of counsel or of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” Local Rule 110. “District courts have inherent power to control their dockets,” and in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions

1 including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831  
2 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute  
3 an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ferdik v.*  
4 *Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order  
5 requiring amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)  
6 (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th  
7 Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules).

8           Accordingly, Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to show cause within 14 days of the date of service of  
9 this Order why the action should not be dismissed for her failure to prosecute and failure comply with  
10 the Court's order or, in the alternative, to file an amended complaint.

11  
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: December 9, 2014

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE