

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
3

4 DOROTHY YORK,

5 Plaintiff,

6 vs.

7 TOCHI E. EZENWUGO,

8 Defendant.

1:16-cv-01034-AWI-EPG

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY  
JUDGMENT SHOULD NOT BE  
ENTERED IN FAVOR OF  
DEFENDANTS FOR FAILURE TO  
RESPOND TO DISPOSITIVE MOTION

**FOURTEEN DAY DEADLINE**

9  
10 Dorothy York (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*  
11 with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case is proceeding on Plaintiff’s  
12 Eighth Amendment claim for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs against  
13 Defendant Ezenwugo. (ECF Nos. 8, 9.)

14 On June 14, 2017, Defendant Ezenwugo filed a motion for summary judgment  
15 contending that judgment should be entered in her favor on the merits of the deliberate  
16 indifference claim and because she is entitled to qualified immunity. (ECF Nos. 30-36.)

17 Defendant’s filing contained a warning to Plaintiff concerning the consequences of  
18 failing to oppose a motion for summary judgment, including the requirements of Local Rule  
19 260. (ECF No. 36.) Under Local Rule 230(l), Plaintiff had 21 days to respond to the motion for  
20 summary judgment. No response has been filed as of the date of this order.

21 Under Local Rule 260(b), a party opposing a motion for summary judgment is required  
22 to “reproduce the itemized facts in the [movant’s] Statement of Undisputed Facts and admit  
23 those facts that are undisputed and deny those that are disputed, including with each denial a  
24 citation to the particular portions of any pleading, affidavit, deposition, interrogatory answer,  
25 admission, or other document relied upon in support of that denial.” Local Rule 230(l) further  
26 provides that a “[f]ailure of the responding party to file an opposition or to file a statement of  
27 no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion and may  
28 result in the imposition of sanctions.”

