

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

GEORGE SCOTT FAST,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:17-cv-00086-SAB

ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANT TO SHOW
CAUSE WHY PLAINTIFF'S SOCIAL
SECURITY APPEAL SHOULD NOT BE
DEEMED UNOPPOSED OR FILE AN
OPPOSITION

TEN-DAY DEADLINE

On October 27, 2017, an order issued granting the parties' stipulation to extend time for Defendant to file an opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief. (ECF No. 16.) Pursuant to the stipulation, the Court ordered Defendant to file her opposition on or before December 11, 2017. Defendant has not filed an opposition brief.

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: December 12, 2017


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE