

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
9

10 LISA LEANNE CLAUSEN,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
14 SECURITY,

15 Defendant.

Case No. 1:17-cv-01484-SAB

**ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANT TO FILE
RESPONSIVE PLEADING OR SHOW CAUSE
WHY THIS ACTION SHOULD NOT BE
DEEMED UNOPPOSED**

FIVE-DAY DEADLINE

16 Plaintiff Lisa Leanne Clausen filed this action seeking judicial review of the denial of
17 benefits by the Commissioner of Social Security on November 3, 2017. (ECF No. 1.) On
18 November 7, 2017, the scheduling order issued. (ECF No. 5.) Pursuant to the scheduling order,
19 the Commissioner’s responsive brief was to be filed within thirty days after service of Plaintiff’s
20 opening brief. (Id. at ¶ 7.)

21 Plaintiff filed her opening brief on July 6, 2018. (ECF No. 15.) Defendant’s responsive
22 brief was due within thirty days, and Defendant has not filed an opposition brief.

23 Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these
24 Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all
25 sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the inherent power to
26 control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate,
27 including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir.
28 2000).

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within five (5) days from the date of
2 service of this order, Defendant shall either file an opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief or a
3 written response to show cause why Plaintiff's opening brief should not be deemed unopposed.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: August 8, 2018


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28