

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**

CARMEN DOLORES PEREZ	)	Case No.: 1:17-cv-1765 -AWI-JLT
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE ACTION
	)	SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR PLAINTIFF'S
v.	)	FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S
	)	ORDER AND FAILURE TO PROSECUTE
QUICKEN LOANS MORTGAGE	)	
SERVICES,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

Carmen Dolores Perez is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with an action against Quicken Loans Mortgage Services. (Doc. 1) On April 9, 2018, the Court determined Plaintiff failed to clearly allege facts supporting a conclusion that the Court has jurisdiction in this action. (Doc. 3 at 3) In addition, the Court noted Plaintiff failed to clearly identify the claims upon which she sought to proceed. (*Id.* at 3-4) Therefore, the Court was ordered to file an amended complaint within thirty days of the date of service. (*Id.* at 5) To date, Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or taken any other action to prosecute this matter.

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

1 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute  
2 an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ferdik v.*  
3 *Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order  
4 requiring amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)  
5 (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th  
6 Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules).

7 Accordingly, Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to show cause **within fourteen days** of the date of  
8 service of this Order why the action should not be dismissed for the failure comply with the Court's  
9 order and failure to prosecute or to file an amended complaint.

10  
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: May 21, 2018

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE