

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 CYNTHIA HOPSON,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 ELIASER MONTANEZ, dba EL CHARRO
13 RESTAURANT, et al.,

14 Defendants.

Case No. 1:15-cv-00803-SAB

ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO
SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS ACTION
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH A COURT
ORDER

(ECF No. 28)

FIVE DAY DEADLINE

15
16 On September 12, 2016, the parties filed a notice of settlement, and an order issued on
17 September 13, 2016, requiring the parties to file dispositive documents on or before October 28,
18 2016. On October 31, 2016, Plaintiff filed a request for an extension of time to file dispositive
19 documents. On November 2, 2016, the Court granted Plaintiff's request for an extension of time
20 to December 5, 2016 to file dispositive documents. The parties were advised that any future
21 requests for extensions of time should be made before the expiration of a deadline. Dispositive
22 documents were not filed, nor did the parties otherwise respond to the November 2, 2016 order.

23 Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these
24 Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all
25 sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the inherent power to
26 control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate,
27 including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir.
28 2000).

1 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS Plaintiff TO SHOW CAUSE within **five (5)**
2 **days** of the date of entry of this order why this action should not be dismissed for failure to
3 comply with the November 2, 2016 order. **Plaintiff is forewarned that the failure to show**
4 **cause may result in the imposition of sanctions, including the dismissal of this action.**

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: December 7, 2016


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE