

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

HURSEL MITCHELL,
Plaintiff,
v.
SECURITY PACIFIC BANK, et. al.,
Defendant.

No. 1:16-CV-00775-AWI-MJS

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED
FOR FAILING TO COMPLY WITH A COURT
ORDER**

(Doc. 2)

Plaintiff is a proceeding *pro se* with a civil complaint in this court.

On June 3, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. (ECF No. 2.) On June 9, 2016, the Court issued an order requesting Plaintiff supplement his in forma pauperis application with a declaration providing more information regarding his income within ten (10) days of issuance of the order. Over ten days have passed and Plaintiff has not responded.

Local Rule 110 provides: "Failure 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 authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court."

///
///

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

Plaintiff is HEREBY ORDERED to, within fourteen (14) days of service of this order, SHOW CAUSE why appropriate sanctions should not be imposed for failing to comply with a court order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 11, 2016

1st Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE