

1 filed with the court and it shall be marked ‘confidential.’” (*Id.*) However, Plaintiff was directed to file
2 “[a] separate proof of service reflecting that the letter brief was served” upon the Commissioner.
3 (Doc. 7 at 2) To date, Plaintiff has not filed a proof of service, and has not requested an extension of
4 time to serve the confidential letter brief.

5 The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide: “Failure of counsel or of a
6 party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any
7 and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” Local Rule 110. “District courts have
8 inherent power to control their dockets,” and in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions
9 including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831
10 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute
11 an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ferdik v.*
12 *Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order);
13 *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with
14 a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to
15 prosecute and to comply with local rules).

16 Accordingly, **within 14 days** Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to show cause why the action should not
17 be dismissed for failure to prosecute or to follow the Court’s Order or to proof of service of the
18 confidential letter brief.

19
20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: May 24, 2017

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE