

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
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CLAUDIA GUERRERO,
Plaintiff,
v.
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY.
Defendant.

Case No. 1:16-cv-00573-SAB
ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO
SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS ACTION
SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT
ORDER
Response due: June 15, 2016

Plaintiff Claudia Guerrero filed a social security complaint on April 23, 2016. (ECF No. 1.) On May 12, 2016, the summons and scheduling order issued. (ECF Nos. 7, 8.) Pursuant to the scheduling order, Plaintiff was required to effect service within twenty days and file a copy of the return of service. (ECF No. 8-1 at ¶ 1.) To date, no return of service has been filed with the Court and there is no indication that Plaintiff has served the summons or complaint.

Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000).

///

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
26
27
28

Accordingly, Plaintiff is HEREBY ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE why this action should not be dismissed for Plaintiff’s failure to comply with the Court’s scheduling order and Plaintiff’s failure to prosecute this action. Plaintiff shall file a written response to this order to show cause no later than **June 15, 2016**. Plaintiff is forewarned that failure to respond to this order to show cause will result in the dismissal of this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **June 7, 2016**



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE