

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 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: July 6, 2022

20 
21 _____
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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.)