UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHARON MANNING, Plaintiff, v. PARSONS TRANSPORTATION GROUP, Defendant.	Case No.: 1:16-cv-0390- JLT ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FOR THE PARTIES' FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S ORDER

On June 13, 2016, the Court granted the motion to compel arbitration, and stayed the matter pending completion of the arbitration. (Doc. 17 at 18) The parties were ordered to file joint status reports every 120 days to keep the Court informed as to the status of the matter. (*Id.*) The parties last filed a joint report on June 1, 2017. (Doc. 22) As a result, the parties were to have filed another status report no later than September 29, 2017. (*See* Doc. 8 at 1) To date, no joint status report has been filed.

The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide: "Failure 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 Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may impose sanctions for failure to prosecute an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61

(9th Cir. 1992) (sanctions for failure to comply with an order); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (imposing sanctions for failure to comply with a court order).

Accordingly, the parties are **ORDERED** to show cause within fourteen days of the date of service of this Order why sanctions should not be imposed for the Court's Order or, in the alternative, to file a joint status report.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 6, 2017**

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE