

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

JOHN STINCHECUM, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
DOLLAR GENERAL CORP.,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:17-cv-00240-DAD-SAB

**ORDER FOR PARTIES TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
THIS ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
FOR FAILURE TO FILE DISPOSITIVE
DOCUMENTS**

FOURTEEN DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff filed this action on December 5, 2016, in the Fresno County Superior Court. (ECF No. 1.) On February 17, 2017, Defendant removed this action to the Eastern District of California. (ECF No. 1.) On June 20, 2018, Defendant filed a notice that this action has settled. (ECF No. 26.) An order issued requiring the parties to file dispositional documents within thirty-days of June 21, 2018. (ECF No. 27.) More than thirty days have passed and the parties have failed to file dispositional documents or otherwise respond to the Court’s 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, the Court HEREBY ORDERS PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE within **fourteen (14) days** of the date of entry of this order this action should not be dismissed as a sanction for the failure to file dispositive documents. The parties are advised that failure to comply with this order will result in the recommendation that this action be dismissed for failure to comply with a court order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 1, 2018


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE