| 1  |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   |  |
| 2  |   |  |
| 4  |   |  |
| 5  |   |  |
| 6  |   |  |
| 7  |   |  |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |  |
| 9  | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |  |
| 10 |   |  |
| 11 | SHIKEB SADDOZAI,  | Case No. 1:20-cv-00358-NONE-JLT (PC)                                       |
| 12 | Plaintiff,  | ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION   |
| 13 | v.  | SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR<br>FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE<br>COURT'S ORDER |
| 14 | J. CEBALLOS, et al.,  | 21-DAY DEADLINE  |
| 15 | Defendants.   | 21-DAT DEADLINE  |
| 16 |   |  |
| 17 | On May 10, 2020, the Court issued a screening order directing Plaintiff, within 21 days, to       |  |
| 18 | file a first amended complaint curing the deficiencies in his pleading. (Doc. 10.) On May 27,     |  |
| 19 | 2020, the Court granted Plaintiff an extension of time to comply with its screening order. (Doc.  |  |
| 20 | 13.) On July 9, 2020, the Court granted Plaintiff a second extension of time. (Doc. 19.) Although |  |
| 21 | more than the allowed time has passed, Plaintiff has failed to file an amended complaint.         |  |
| 22 | The Local Rules, corresponding with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, provide,                  |  |
| 23 | "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with any order of the Court may be grounds for      |  |
| 24 | the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions within the inherent power of the Court."     |  |
| 25 | Local Rule 110. "District courts have inherent power to control their dockets" and, in exercising |  |
| 26 | that power, may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. Thompson v. Housing Auth.,    |  |
| 27 | City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a  |  |
| 28 | party's failure to prosecute an action, obey a c  | ourt order, or comply with local rules. See, e.g.,                         |
|    |   |  |

| 1  | Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with a   |  |
|----|--|--|
| 2  | court order to amend a complaint); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir.     |  |
| 3  | 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421,      |  |
| 4  | 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules).            |  |
| 5  | Accordingly, Plaintiff is <b>ORDERED</b> to show cause in writing, within 21 days of the date        |  |
| 6  | of service of this order, why this action should not be dismissed for his failure to comply with the |  |
| 7  | Court's order. Alternatively, within that same time, Plaintiff may file a first amended complaint    |  |
| 8  | curing the deficiencies identified in the Court's screening order (Doc. 10) or a notice of voluntary |  |
| 9  | dismissal of this case. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation that       |  |
| 10 | this case be dismissed for failure to state a claim and to obey a court order.                       |  |
| 11 |  |  |
| 12 | IT IS SO ORDERED.  |  |
| 13 | Dated: August 25, 2020 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston<br>UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE                    |  |
| 14 | UNITED STATES MADISTRATE JUDDE   |  |
| 15 |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |
|    | 2  |  |
|    |  |  |