1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		S DISTRICT COURT
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	ANGELINA NUNES, et al.,	Case No. 1:17-cv-00633-DAD-SAB
12	Plaintiffs,	ORDER REQUIRING PARTIES TO SHOW
13	V.	CAUSE IN WRITING WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT ISSUE FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY
14	COUNTY OF STANISLAUS, et al.,	(ECF No. 98)
15	Defendants.	DEADLINE: JULY 11, 2022
16		
17		,
18	Plaintiffs Angelina Nunes, Emanuel Alves, and minors D.X. and L.X.'s (collectively	
19	"Plaintiffs") initiated this civil action against Defendants County of Stanislaus, Kristen Johnson,	
20	and Eric Anderson on May 5, 2017. (ECF No. 1.) This action arises from the temporary removal	
21	of Plaintiffs' minor children from their custody by Defendants for a period of fifty-one days	
22	during the summer of 2016, which Plaintiffs claim was unlawful and without a warrant or exigent	
23	circumstances. (Id.) On March 21, 2022, Plaintiffs filed a petition for minor's compromise,	
24	which Defendants have not opposed. (ECF No. 91.) The matter was referred to a United States	
25	Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
26	On May 31, 2022, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations,	
27	recommending that the petition for minor's compromise as to Plaintiffs D.X. and L.X.'s claims be	
28	granted and the settlement be approved. (E	CF No. 97.) No parties objected to the findings and

1	recommendations and on June 21, 2022, the district judge adopted the findings and	
2	recommendations in full. (ECF No. 98.) The parties were directed to file a stipulation or request	
3	for dismissal of the action within fourteen days, or July 5, 2022. ¹ (Id. at 2.) The Court notes that	
4	the deadline to file dispositional documents has expired, but nothing has been filed.	
5	Local Rule 110 provides that "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules	
6	or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all	
7	sanctions within the inherent power of the Court." The Court has the inherent power to	
8	control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate,	
9	including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles Cnty., 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir.	
10	2000).	
11	The Court shall require the parties to show cause why sanctions should not issue for the	
12	failure to file dispositional documents in compliance with the Court's June 21, 2022 order.	
13	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
14	1. The parties shall show cause in writing no later than July 11, 2022, why	
15	monetary sanctions should not issue for the failure to file dispositional documents	
16	as required by the June 21, 2022 order; and	
17	2. Failure to comply with this order will result in the issuance of sanctions.	
18		
19	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
20	Dated: July 6, 2022 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	¹ The district judge's order also remanded the matter to the magistrate judge for further proceedings consistent with his order. (ECF No. 98 at 2.)	