UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA JOHN LUCAS, No. 1:18-cv-00654-DAD-JLT Plaintiff. v. DER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY CASE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO FOLLOW A COURT ORDER DONNY YOUNGBLOOD, et al., **Fourteen-Day Deadline** Defendants. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this suit, alleging claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Generally speaking, plaintiff alleges that defendants failed to accept custody of his ex-wife after plaintiff subjected her to a citizen's arrest based on her alleged perjury during a state court civil

Generally speaking, plaintiff alleges that defendants failed to accept custody of his ex-wife after plaintiff subjected her to a citizen's arrest based on her alleged perjury during a state court civil proceeding, and that this violated his constitutional rights. On June 29, 2018, this court granted a motion by defendants to redact personal information, because plaintiff had included in the complaint the home addresses of a number of the individual defendants. (Doc. Nos. 7, 8.) In that minute order, which was served on plaintiff, the court directed that the complaint would be sealed and that "[p]laintiff shall file an appropriately redacted complaint immediately." (Doc. Nos. 8, 9.) However, no redacted complaint has been filed.

Accordingly, plaintiff is hereby ordered to show cause within fourteen (14) days of this order why this case should not be dismissed due to his failure to follow the court's prior order of June 29, 2018. Plaintiff may discharge this order to show cause by filing a first amended

complaint within this fourteen-day period in which the home addresses of the various defendants are redacted, along with any other redactions required under Local Rule 140. Plaintiff is cautioned that failing to appropriately respond to this order may result in the imposition of sanctions, including possible dismissal of this action. See Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1262 (9th Cir. 1992); Thompson v. Housing Auth. of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). Given the above, the hearing on the motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 9), originally set for August 7, 2018, is vacated, to be reset following the discharge of this order to show cause. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **July 31, 2018**