

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

WILLIAM FABRICIUS,

Plaintiff,

v.

TULARE COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

1:15-cv-1779-LJO-EPG

**ORDER DISMISSING CASE WITH
PREJUDICE**

Currently pending before this Court are Plaintiff’s claims for unreasonable force against Tulare County Sheriff Officers Bradley McLean and Lance Heiden (collectively, “Defendants”). *See* ECF No. 106. On June 28, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge issued an order directing Plaintiff to show cause within 30 days why this action should not be dismissed as barred by the applicable statute of limitations. ECF No. 110 (“OSC”). On August 7, 2018, the magistrate judge granted Plaintiff an extension of time to respond to the OSC, but warned Plaintiff that “[f]ailure to file a response in compliance with this order and the [OSC] shall result in the dismissal of this case.” ECF No. 112. Despite this warning, instead of filing a response to the OSC, on October 15, 2018, Plaintiff filed yet another request for an extension of time – this time asking for an additional 90-day extension. ECF No. 113. That request was denied on October 18, 2018, and Plaintiff was ordered to file his response to the OSC on or before November 1, 2018 or face dismissal. ECF No. 114. That deadline has come and gone, without a word from Plaintiff.

1 For the reasons set forth in the OSC, ECF No. 110, this Court finds that Plaintiff's entire
2 complaint is barred by the statute of limitations. Accordingly, dismissal with prejudice is appropriate.

3 **CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

4 For the reasons set forth above, Plaintiff's remaining claims are dismissed with prejudice. The
5 Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE THIS CASE.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: November 9, 2018

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25