1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	MICHELLE RENEE ROSS,) Case No.: 1:17-cv-01439 - JLT
12	Plaintiff,	 ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR
13	v.) PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND
14	NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S) ORDER
15	Defendant.)
16		_)
17	Michelle Renee Ross initiated this action by filing a complaint on October 25, 2017, seeking	
18	judicial review of a decision to denying her application for Social Security benefits. (Doc. 1) On	
19	October 30, 2017, the Court issued its Scheduling Order, setting forth the applicable deadlines. (Doc. 5)	
20	Defendant filed the certified administrative record in the matter on March 5, 2018. (Doc. 10)	
21	Pursuant to the terms of the Scheduling Order, within thirty days of the filing of the administrative	
22	record, Plaintiff was to serve "a letter brief outlining the reasons why[] she contends that a remand is	
23	warranted," and file "proof of service reflecting that the letter brief was served." (Doc. 5 at 2) Thus,	
24	Plaintiff was to serve a confidential letter brief no later than April 4, 2018. To date, no proof of service	
25	has been filed, and Plaintiff has not requested an extension of time to comply with the Court's order.	
26	The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide: "Failure of counsel or of a	
27	party to comply with any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any	
28	and all sanctions within the inherent power	r of the Court." Local Rule 110. "District courts have

1	inherent power to control their dockets," and in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions	
2	including dismissal of an action. <i>Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles</i> , 782 F.2d 829, 831	
3	(9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute	
4	an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. <i>See</i> , <i>e.g. Ferdik v</i> .	
5	Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order);	
6	Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with	
7	a court order); <i>Henderson v. Duncan</i> , 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to	
8	prosecute and to comply with local rules).	
9	Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause within fourteen days of the date of service	
10	of this order why the sanctions should not be imposed for failure to follow the Court's order and	
11	failure to prosecute the action or to serve a confidential letter brief and file proof of service with the	
12	Court.	
13		
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
15	Dated:April 19, 2018/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston	
16	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
_0		
	2	