## 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 IGNACIO PULIDO, 11 Case No.: 1:17-cv-00884 - JLT 12 Plaintiff, ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR 13 v. PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting Commissioner of Social Security, **ORDER** 15 Defendant. 16 17 Ignacio Pulido initiated this action by filing a complaint on July 5, 2017, seeking judicial review 18 of the decision to denying an application for Social Security benefits. (Doc. 1) On July 24, 2017, the 19 Court entered its Scheduling Order, setting forth the applicable deadlines. (Doc. 8-1) Pursuant to the 20 Scheduling Order, the parties exchanged confidential letter briefs, with Defendant serving the 21 Commissioner's response on February 26, 2018. (Doc. 17) 22 In the Court's Scheduling Order, Plaintiff was ordered to file an opening brief addressing "each

1

23

24

25

26

27

28

requested a further extension of time.

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

Commissioner's response. (See Doc. 8-1 at 2, explaining the applicable briefing deadlines) Therefore,

Plaintiff's opening brief was due March 28, 2018. To date, Plaintiff has not filed an opening brief or

claimed error" by the administrative law judge within thirty days of the date of service of the

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 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See*, *e.g. Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules).

Accordingly, within 14 days, Plaintiff **SHALL** show cause in writing why the action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and to follow the Court's Order or to file an opening brief.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 29, 2018 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE