

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

TERREN DANAE COOK,
Plaintiff,
v.
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:16-cv-00631-SAB
ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW
CAUSE WHY THIS ACTION SHOULD NOT BE
DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH
COURT ORDER
SEVEN DAY DEADLINE

On May 2, 2016, Plaintiff filed the present action in this court seeking review of the Commissioner’s denial of an application for benefits. On May 6, 2016, the Court issued a scheduling order. (ECF No. 6). The scheduling order states that within 95 days from the filing of the administrative record, Plaintiff shall file an opening brief. Defendant lodged the Social Security administrative record on October 11, 2016. (ECF No. 11.) More than 95 days have passed and Plaintiff has not filed an opening brief nor sought an extension of time to do so.

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,

1 including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir.
2 2000).

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file a written response to this
4 order to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the
5 scheduling order within seven (7) days of the date of service of this order. Failure to comply with
6 this order to show cause shall result in this action being dismissed for failure to prosecute.

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: January 26, 2017


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28