

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**

MARTIN V. HERNANDEZ,)	Case No.: 1:16-cv-01011-JLT
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION
v.)	SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE
)	TO OBEY WITH A COURT ORDER
RAYMOND D. MADDEN, Warden,)	
)	[FOURTEEN DAY DEADLINE]
Respondent.)	
)	
)	
)	

On July 18, 2016, the Court screened the petition for writ of habeas corpus. The Court found that Petitioner had failed to state any claims for relief. The petition was dismissed and Petitioner was directed to file a First Amended Petition within thirty days. Over thirty days have passed and Petitioner has failed to comply or otherwise respond to the Court’s order. Local Rule 110 provides that “a failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Local Rules or 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.”

///
///
///
///

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, Petitioner is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE within 14 days of the date of service of this order why the action should not be dismissed for failure to obey a court order and for failure to state a cognizable claim.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 7, 2016

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE