

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**

MARIBEL M. WATSCHKE,)	Case No.: 1:17-cv-1211-DAD - JLT
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS
)	SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED PLAINTIFF'S
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,)	FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S
Defendant.)	ORDER AND FAILURE TO PROSECUTE
)	
)	

On January 29, 2018, the Court dismissed Plaintiff's first amended complaint with leave to amend. (Doc. 12) The Court indicated it would give Plaintiff a final opportunity to state a claim upon which relief could be granted by the Court, and directed her to file a Second Amended Complaint within thirty days. (*Id.* at 5) To date, Plaintiff has not filed a Second Amended Complaint or requested additional time to comply with the Court's order.

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 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.*

