

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 ISAAC DA'BOUR DAWSON,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 CDCR, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16
17

1:15-cv-01867-DAD-GSA-PC

ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO
FILE OPPOSITION OR STATEMENT
OF NON-OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
DISMISS, WITHIN TWENTY-ONE
DAYS
(ECF No. 27.)

TWENTY-ONE DAY DEADLINE

18 On December 14, 2016, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss this case. (ECF No. 27.)
19 Plaintiff Isaac Da'bour Dawson ("Plaintiff") was required to file an opposition or a statement of
20 non-opposition to the motion within twenty-one days, but has not done so. Local Rule 230(l).

21 Local Rule 230(l) provides that the failure to oppose a motion "may be deemed a waiver
22 of any opposition to the granting of the motion..." The court may deem any failure to oppose
23 Defendants' motion for terminating sanctions as a waiver, and recommend that the motion be
24 granted on that basis.

25 Failure to follow a district court's local rules is a proper ground for dismissal. U.S. v.
26 Warren, 601 F.2d 471, 474 (9th Cir. 1979). Thus, a court may dismiss an action for the
27 plaintiff's failure to oppose a motion to dismiss, where the applicable local rule determines that
28 failure to oppose a motion will be deemed a waiver of opposition. See Ghazali v. Moran, 46

1 F.3d 52 (9th Cir. 1995), cert. denied 516 U.S. 838 (1995) (dismissal upheld even where
2 plaintiff contends he did not receive motion to dismiss, where plaintiff had adequate notice,
3 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b), and time to file opposition); cf. Marshall v. Gates, 44 F.3d 722,
4 725 (9th Cir. 1995); Henry v. Gill Industries, Inc., 983 F.2d 943, 949-50 (9th Cir. 1993)
5 (motion for summary judgment cannot be granted simply as a sanction for a local rules
6 violation, without an appropriate exercise of discretion). The court may also dismiss this case
7 for Plaintiff's failure to comply with the court's order. See Local Rule 110; Pagtalunan v.
8 Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002)

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 10 1. Within **twenty-one days** of the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall file
11 an opposition or statement of non-opposition to the motion to dismiss filed by
12 Defendants Guzman, Gonzales, Marsh, and Johnson on December 14, 2016; and
- 13 2. Plaintiff's failure to comply with this order may result in the dismissal of this
14 action.

15
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: April 13, 2017

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE