

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,	)	
v.	)	ORDER DISMISSING ACTION FOR FAILURE TO
	)	OBEY WITH A COURT ORDER
RAYMOND D. MADDEN, Warden,	)	ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO
Respondent.	)	ENTER JUDGMENT AND CLOSE CASE
	)	

---

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 Court dismissed the petition and directed the Petitioner to file a First Amended Petition within thirty days. Over thirty days passed and Petitioner failed to comply or otherwise respond to the Court’s order. Therefore, on September 7, 2016, the Court issued an order directing Petitioner to show cause within fourteen days why the petition should not be dismissed for failure to obey a court order and for failure to state a cognizable claim.<sup>1</sup> Over fourteen days have passed and Petitioner has failed to 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.”

---

<sup>1</sup> On September 7, 2016, Petitioner consented to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).

1           Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that the petition for writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED**  
2 for failure to obey a court order and for failure to state a cognizable claim. The Clerk of Court is  
3 **DIRECTED** to enter judgment and close the case.  
4

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: October 3, 2016

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28