

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**

NICHOLAS ESTRADA,)	Case No.: 1:18-cv-00599-AWI-SAB (PC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION
v.)	SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE
)	TO PROSECUTE AND COMPLY WITH A
CALIFORNIA CORRECTIONAL)	COURT ORDER
INSTITUTION, et al.,)	
)	(ECF Nos. 25, 26)
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff Nicholas Estrada is appearing *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On August 20, 2020, the Court set this case for a settlement conference before United States Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe on October 14, 2020, at 9:30 a.m. (ECF No. 25.)

On September 17, 2020, the Court directed that the parties appear remotely at the settlement conference. (ECF No. 26.) The September 17, 2020 order specifically stated that Plaintiff could “appear by video, if he has access to a device with an internet connection and a web camera. If Plaintiff does not have access to such a device, he may appear by telephone. Counsel for Defendants shall appear by video, via the Zoom application. Counsel for Defendants shall contact Courtroom Deputy, Esther Valdez, at (559) 499-5788 or evaldez@caed.uscourts.gov for the video and dial-in information, including any necessary passcodes, for all parties. Counsel for Defendants shall then

1 provide the appropriate contact information to the Plaintiff (both Zoom video information and Zoom
2 dial-in information) by private communication to facilitate Plaintiff's remote appearance. Plaintiff may
3 also contact the Courtroom Deputy directly to obtain the necessary video and dial-in information."
4 (ECF No. 26 at 1:22-2:2.)

5 Plaintiff did not appear at the October 14, 2020 settlement conference or otherwise
6 communicate with the Court or defense counsel.

7 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that, within **fourteen (14) days** from the date of
8 service of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause in writing why the instant action should not be
9 dismissed for Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's August 25, 2020 order and failure to
10 prosecute this action. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); see also Local Rule 110 ("Failure of ... a party to
11 comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of
12 any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court."); Local
13 Rule 183(a) (a pro se party's failure to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the court's
14 Local Rules, and other applicable law may be ground for dismissal). Plaintiff is warned that failure to
15 comply with this order will result in a recommendation to a District Judge that the instant action be
16 dismissed for failure to comply with a court order and failure to prosecute.

17
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: October 14, 2020



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE