

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

VALENTIN FELICIANO,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
IGBINOSA, et al.,  
Defendants.

**Case No. 1:15-cv-01735-DAD-JLT (PC)**  
**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S ORDER AND TO PROSECUTE THIS ACTION**  
**(Doc. 11)**  
**21 DAY DEADLINE**

Plaintiff, Valentin Feliciano, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 based on receipt of inadequate medical care. The Complaint was screened per 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a) and dismissed with leave to amend within 30 days. (Doc. 11.) On April 19, 2016, Plaintiff's request for a 30-day extension of time to file a first amended complaint was granted. (Docs. 12, 13.) More than a month has now passed and Plaintiff has failed to file an amended complaint, or to otherwise respond to the Court's Order.

The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide, “[f]ailure of counsel, or of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” Local Rule 110. “District courts have inherent power to control their dockets,” and in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Authority of*

1 *Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice,  
2 based on a party's failure to prosecute an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to  
3 comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)  
4 (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S.*  
5 *Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court  
6 order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to  
7 prosecute and to comply with local rules). Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 8 1. **Within 21 days** Plaintiff **SHALL** show cause in writing why this action should not  
9 be dismissed for his failure to comply with the Court's order and to prosecute this  
10 action; and
- 11 2. **Plaintiff's failure to respond to this order in the time provided will result in**  
12 **recommendation that this action be dismissed with prejudice.**

13  
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: June 2, 2016

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28