

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

LESLIE HERMAN,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,  
  
Defendant.

Case No. 1:15-cv-00456-AWI-SAB  
  
ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF’S  
COUNSEL TO SHOW CAUSE WHY  
SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT ISSUE FOR  
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH NOVEMBER  
21, 2018 ORDER

On November 21, 2018, findings and recommendations were filed which recommended granting counsel’s (“Petitioner”) motion for attorney fees. (ECF No. 28.) Petitioner was required to serve a copy of the findings and recommendations on the plaintiff and file a proof of service within five days of the date of the order. (Id.) Petitioner has failed to file a proof of service in compliance with the November 21, 2018 order.

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.” The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000).

///

1           Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Jacqueline Forslund shall show cause in  
2 writing within five days why sanctions should not issue for the failure to file a proof of service in  
3 compliance with the Court's November 21, 2018 order.

4  
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: December 26, 2018

  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28