1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7	PERCY LEE RHODES,	) Case No.: 1:15-cv-01714-SAB (PC)
8	Plaintiff,	) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH A COURT ORDER
9	v.	
10	FRESNO COUNTY, et al.,	
11	Defendants.	)
12		)
13	Plaintiff Percy Lee Rhodes is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action	
14	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), Plaintiff consented to the jurisdiction of	
15	the United States Magistrate Judge on November 23, 2015. Local Rule 302.	
16	On December 8, 2016, the Court screened Plaintiff's second amended complaint and directed	
17	Plaintiff to file a third amended complaint or notify the Court of his intent to proceed on the claims	
18	found to be cognizable within thirty days. (ECF No. 29.) Over thirty days have passed and Plaintiff	
19	has failed to respond to the Court's order. Accordingly, within twenty (20) days from the date of	
20	service of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause why the action should not be dismissed for failure to	
21	prosecute. The failure to respond to this order will result in dismissal of the action for failure to	
22	prosecute. Local Rule 110.	
23		
24	IT IS SO ORDERED.	SAR
25	Dated: January 18, 2017	Jung N. are
26		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27		
28		
		1