

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

MARC ALAN RENFRO,
Plaintiff,
v.
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,
Defendant.

Case No.: 1:16-cv-01733-SAB
**ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANT TO
SHOW CAUSE WHY PLAINTIFF’S SOCIAL
SECURITY APPEAL SHOULD NOT BE
DEEMED UNOPPOSED**
TEN-DAY DEADLINE

On July 25, 2017, an order issued granting the parties stipulation to extend time for briefing. Pursuant to the order addressing the stipulation, Defendant’s response to Plaintiff’s opening brief was to be filed on or before September 13, 2017. Defendant did not file a response in compliance with the July 25, 2017 order.

Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000).

///

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, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within ten (10) days from the date of service of this order, Defendant shall either file a written response to this order to show cause why Plaintiff's opening brief should not be deemed unopposed or file an opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 15, 2017


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE