

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

KENNETH LOPEZ,
Plaintiff,
v.
I. MEDINA, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:19-cv-00794-DAD-SKO (PC)
**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
TO DISMISS ACTION WITHOUT
PREJUDICE**
14-DAY DEADLINE

On March 18, 2020, the Court issued a screening order finding that Plaintiff failed to state a cognizable claim and granting her leave to file a second amended complaint.¹ (Doc. 15.) Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint. On April 14, 2020, Plaintiff filed a response to the Court’s screening order, in which she states, “I repeat: I will not seek help from courts again. Any further correspondence from you will be refused.” (Doc. 16.)

The Local Rules, corresponding with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, provide, “[f]ailure 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, may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Auth.*,

¹ Plaintiff states that she suffers from gender dysphoria, identifies as female, and refers to herself with female pronouns. (See Doc. 1 at 14.) The Court, therefore, uses female pronouns to refer to Plaintiff.

