1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	SCOTT K. RICKS,	Case No. 1:15-cv-00715-DAD-BAM (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION
13	V.	SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT ORDER AND FAILURE TO PROSECUTE
14	KAMENA,	
15	Defendant.	(ECF No. 55)
16		FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE
17	Plaintiff Scott K. Ricks ("Plaintiff") is a former state prisoner proceeding pro se and in	
18	forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action proceeds	
19	against Defendant Kamena for failure to protect and deliberate indifference. This matter is set for	
20	a telephonic trial confirmation hearing on May 6, 2019, and a jury trial on July 9, 2019.	
21	On September 26, 2018, the Court issued a second scheduling order directing Plaintiff to	
22	file his pretrial statement and any motion for attendance of incarcerated witnesses on or before	
23	April 8, 2019. (ECF No. 55.) This matter was then set for a settlement conference before	
24	Magistrate Judge Jennifer L. Thurston on March 4, 2019. (ECF No. 57.) The case did not settle,	
25	and therefore the deadlines set in the Court's second scheduling order remained in effect. (ECF	
26	No. 61.) The deadline for Plaintiff's pretrial statement and motion for attendance of incarcerated	
27	witnesses has expired, and Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's scheduling order or to	
28	///	

otherwise communicate with the Court.¹ Accordingly, Plaintiff is HEREBY ORDERED to show cause by written response why this action should not be dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to obey the Court's order and for failure to prosecute. Plaintiff's response is due within **fourteen (14) days** from the date of service of this order. If Plaintiff fails to file a response, or the response does not demonstrate good cause, the undersigned will recommend that this matter be dismissed. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **April 18, 2019**

/s/Barbara A. McAuliffe

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ Plaintiff was reminded of his obligation to keep updated on all Court orders, as well as to consider changing his mailing address to ensure that he receives all of his mail. (ECF No. 61.) Plaintiff has not updated his mailing address since May 9, 2018. (ECF No. 48.) Plaintiff was also previously warned that, as a former prisoner, the prison mailbox rule no longer applies to his filings. (ECF No. 55, p. 3 n.1.) As such, Plaintiff's filings are complete only