

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KHINE NYAN TUN,

v.

RAFAEL ZUNIGA,

Petitioner,

Respondent.

Case No. 1:14-cv-01810 MJS (HC)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED
FOR FAILING TO COMPLY WITH A
COURT ORDER**

(Doc. 11)

**ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT
TO SERVE ORDER ON UNITED STATES
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE**

Petitioner is a federal prisoner proceeding *pro se* with a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

On November 21, 2014, an order directing Respondent to file a response to the petition was issued in this case wherein Respondent was directed to file a response to the petition within sixty (60) days. (ECF No. 11.) In addition, Respondent was directed to file a notice of appearance and a consent to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction form with the Court. (ECF Nos.11-12.) On November 24, 2014, Respondent filed a notice of appearance and a Magistrate Judge consent form. (ECF Nos. 14-15.)

As of this date, over sixty (60) days have passed and the Court has not received a response from Respondent as required by the November 21, 2014 order.

Local Rule 110 provides: "Failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these

1 Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any
2 and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.”

3 Respondent is HEREBY ORDERED to, within fourteen (14) days of service of this
4 order, SHOW CAUSE why appropriate sanctions should not be imposed for failing to
5 comply with a court order.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: February 2, 2015

/s/ Michael J. Seng
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28