UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JESSE WASHINGTON,) Case No.: 1:15-cv-00725-DAD-BAM (PC)
Plaintiff, v. P. ROUCH, et al.,	ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO FILE OPPOSITION OR STATEMENT OF NON- OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
Defendants.) (ECF No. 35)
	THIRTY (30) DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff Jesse Washington is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case currently proceeds on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim of deliberate indifference to his medical needs against Defendants Rouch and Sisodia.

On January 5, 2018, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56. (ECF No. 35.) Plaintiff was provided with notice of the requirements for opposing a motion for summary judgment. Woods v. Carey, 684 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2012); Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952, 957 (9th Cir. 1988); Klingele v. Eikenberry, 849 F.2d 409, 411–12 (9th Cir. 1988). (ECF No. 35-1.)

Plaintiff's response was due within twenty-one (21) days of the date of service of Defendants' motion. That deadline has passed, but Plaintiff has not filed an opposition or statement of non-opposition to the motion. Plaintiff also has not otherwise communicated with the Court.

1	Pursuant to Local Rule 230(1), Plaintiff is HEREBY ORDERED to file an opposition or a
2	statement of non-opposition to Defendants' motion for summary judgment within thirty (30) days.
3	Plaintiff is warned that the failure to comply with this order may result in the imposition of
4	sanctions, including a recommendation to dismiss this action.
5	
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.
7	Dated: February 6, 2018 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
8	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	