1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	EDWARD THOMAS,	Case No. 1:16-cv-01393-LJO-SKO (PC)
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
11	V.	FOR PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S ORDER
12	S. PARKS, et al.,	AND FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM
13	Defendants.	(Doc. 17)
14		TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE
15		
16	Plaintiff, Edward Thomas, is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in	
17	this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On June 6, 2017, the Court issued an order	
18	finding that Plaintiff failed to state any cognizable claims, dismissing the Complaint, and granting	
19	Plaintiff leave to file a first amended complaint within thirty days. (Doc. 17.) Three months have	
20	now passed and Plaintiff has not filed a first amended complaint or otherwise responded to the	
21	Court's screening order. ¹	
22	The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide, "[f]ailure of counsel or	
23	of a party to comply with any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the	
24	Court of any and all sanctions within the inherent power of the Court." Local Rule 110.	
25	"District courts have inherent power to control their dockets," and in exercising that power, a	
26		
27	¹ Plaintiff has filed a notice of appeal challenging denial of motions for injunctive relief. (<i>See</i> Doc. 24.) However, this Court retains jurisdiction over this action because no appeal lies from an order denying requests for injunctive	
28	relief. <i>Wilborn v. Escalderon</i> , 789 F.2d 1328, 1330 (9th Cir. 1986). This action shall, therefore, proceed without further delay.	

I

1	court may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. Thompson v. Housing Authority of	
2	Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice,	
3	based on a party's failure to prosecute, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with	
4	local rules. See, e.g. Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for	
5	failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); Malone v. U.S. Postal	
6	Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order);	
7	Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and	
8	to comply with local rules).	
9	Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause <u>within twenty-one (21) days</u> of the	
10	date of service of this order why the action should not be dismissed for his failure to state a claim	
11	and to comply with the Court's screening order (Doc. 17); alternatively, within that same time,	
12	Plaintiff may file a first amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal.	
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
14		
15	Dated: September 19, 2017 s Sheila K. Oberto	
16	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	