UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIMOTHY SEAN VINCENT, Plaintiff, v. COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, Defendant.	Case No. 1:17-cv-01578-SAB ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANT TO FILE RESPONSIVE PLEADING OR SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DEEMED UNOPPOSED SEVEN-DAY DEADLINE

On August 15, 2018, an order issued granting the parties stipulation to extend time for briefing. Pursuant to the order, Defendant's opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief was due on or before October 15, 2018. (ECF No. 15.) Defendant has not filed a timely opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief.

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. 2000).

/ / /

/ / /

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Within seven (7) days from the date of service of this order, Defendant shall either file an opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief or a written response to show cause why Plaintiff's opening brief should not be deemed unopposed.

2. Plaintiff's reply, if any, shall be filed within fifteen (15) days from the date of filing of Defendant's opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 17, 2018**

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE