

1 The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide: “Failure of counsel or of a
2 party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any
3 and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” Local Rule 110. “District courts have
4 inherent power to control their dockets,” and in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions
5 including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831
6 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute
7 an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ferdik v.*
8 *Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order
9 requiring amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)
10 (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th
11 Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules).

12 Accordingly, **within 14 days**, Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to show cause in writing why sanctions
13 should—up to and including dismissal of the action—not be imposed for his failure to comply with the
14 Court’s order. Alternatively, he may file an amended motion to proceed in forma pauperis or pay the
15 filing fee within 14 days.

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: December 17, 2015

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE