1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JUVENTINO RIOS,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-0372-JLT
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER TO PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE ACTION SHOULD NOT BE
13	v	DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S ORDER
14	CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, et al.,	WITH THE COOKT 5 OKDER
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	On July 18, 2016, the Court granted the motion to withdraw as counsel filed by J. Miguel	
18	Flores, and ordered Plaintiff to "file a notification indicating whether he intends to represent himself	
19	going forward or whether he will retain a new attorney" no later than July 29, 2016. (Doc. 19 at 3)	
20	The Court instructed Plaintiff that if he intended to hire an attorney, he must notify the Court regarding	
21	when that would occur. (Id.) To date, Plaintiff has not responded to the Court's order.	
22	The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide: "Failure of counsel or of a	
23	party to comply with any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any	
24	and all sanctions within the inherent power of the Court." Local Rule 110. "District courts have	
25	inherent power to control their dockets," and in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions	
26	including dismissal of an action. Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831	

27 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute
28 an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ferdik v.*

1	Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and comply with		
2	an order); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to		
3	comply with a court order); <i>Henderson v. Duncan</i> , 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for		
4	failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules).		
5	Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause within 14 days of the date of service of		
6	this Order why the action should not be dismissed for his failure to comply with the Court's order or,		
7	in the alternative, to file a notification indicating whether he intends to represent himself or will be		
8	hiring counsel.		
9			
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
11	Dated: August 3, 2016 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston		
12	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	2		