

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**

EDWARD MORRIS,)	Case No.: 1:17-cv-0100-DAD- JLT
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE REQUEST
)	TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS SHOULD
v.)	NOT BE DENIED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY
)	WITH THE COURT’S ORDER
NORTH OF THE RIVER COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

Edward Morris initiated this action by filing a complaint and a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on January 23, 2017. (Docs. 1, 2) The Court found the information provided in the application to proceed without the payment of a filing fee was insufficient to determine whether Plaintiff satisfies the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). (Doc. 3 at 1) Therefore, Plaintiff was ordered “to file, within fourteen days . . . , an application that includes information on how Plaintiff is supporting himself, or his dependence on another.” (*Id.* at 2) Although more than fourteen days have passed, Plaintiff failed to file an amended application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide: “Failure of counsel or of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” Local Rule 110. “District courts have inherent power to control their dockets,” and in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831

1 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may impose sanctions, including dismissal, based on a party's failure to
2 prosecute an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g.*
3 *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (sanctions for failure to comply with an
4 order); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (sanctions for failure to
5 comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (sanctions for
6 failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules). Indeed, in the order directing Plaintiff to file an
7 amended application, he was "warned that failure to comply with this order may result in denial of his
8 application to proceed *in forma pauperis*." (Doc. 3 at 2)

9 Accordingly, within 14 days, Plaintiff SHALL show cause in writing his application to proceed
10 *in forma pauperis* should not be denied. Alternatively, within 14 days, he may file the amended
11 motion previously ordered by the Court.

12 **Plaintiff is advised that his failure to comply with this order will result in a**
13 **recommendation that his request to proceed in forma pauperis be denied.**

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: February 21, 2017

17 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28