

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSHUA HECKATHORN,
Plaintiff,
v.
KIM HOLLAND,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:17-cv-1416 AWI-JLT
**ORDER TO THE PLAINTIFF AND HIS
COUNSEL TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE
IMPOSED FOR THEIR FAILURE TO
COMPLY WITH THE COURT’S ORDER**

On March 19, 2018, the defendants filed an ex parte request for an extension of time to file their first amended complaint. (Doc. 15) They indicate that they filed the request ex parte because plaintiff’s counsel refused to consent to the request. *Id.* at 2. Construing the filing as a request to proceed on shortened time, the Court ordered the plaintiff to respond no later than March 23. (Doc. 16) The Court required the plaintiff to “detail his reasoning and support it by citation to legal authority” if he still opposed the request for the extension of time. *Id.* Nevertheless, the plaintiff and his counsel failed to respond. Therefore, the Court **ORDERS:**

1. **No later than March 30, 2018**, the plaintiff and his counsel of records **SHALL** show cause in writing why sanctions, up to and including dismissal of the action, should not be imposed for their failure to comply with the Court’s orders;

///

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

2. Pending resolution of this order to show cause, the defendant need not file her responsive pleading.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 26, 2018

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE