

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

LAWRENCE CONWAY,
Plaintiff,
v.
QUINONEZ,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cv-00976-NONE-SKO (PC)

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
TO DISMISS ACTION FOR FAILURE TO
OBEY COURT ORDERS AND FAILURE TO
STATE A CLAIM**

14-DAY DEADLINE

On October 21, 2020, the Court screened Plaintiff’s complaint and found that it fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted. (Doc. 11.) The Court granted Plaintiff leave to amend within 21 days. (*Id.*) Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint or otherwise respond to the Court’s screening order. Therefore, on December 4, 2020, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause, within 21 days, why this action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with a court order. (Doc. 12.) Although more than the allowed time has passed, Plaintiff has not responded to the order to show cause.

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.*,

