

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

RICARDO TORRES,
Plaintiff,
v.
LA FAVORITA BROADCASTING, INC. et
al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:17-cv-00888-LJO-SAB
ORDER REQUIRING PARTIES TO SHOW
CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT
ISSUE FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH
COURT ORDER
(ECF No. 42)
FIVE-DAY DEADLINE

On November 21, 2018, the Court conducted an informal telephonic conference call during which the parties raised a discovery dispute. An order issued requiring the parties to either notify the Court that the discovery disputes had resolved or submit confidential briefs regarding the dispute by 5:00 p.m. on December 5, 2018. The parties did not notify the Court that the dispute has resolved nor did they submit confidential briefs regarding the dispute in compliance with the 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.

1 2000).

2 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS the parties to SHOW CAUSE within **five (5)**
3 **days** of the date of entry of this order why sanctions should not issue for the failure to comply
4 with the November 21, 2018 order.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: **December 10, 2018**


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28