1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ERICK EDDIE RODRIGUEZ,	Case No.: 1:21-cv-00898-DAD-SKO (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO OBEY COURT ORDER
13	v.	
14	M. CATE, et al.,	21-DAY DEADLINE
15	Defendants.	21-DAT DEADLINE
16		
17	Plaintiff Erick Eddie Rodriguez is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights	
18	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
19	On August 23, 2021, the undersigned issued Findings and Recommendations to Deny	
20	Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed <i>In Forma Pauperis</i> . (Doc. 21.) Following re-service by mail to a	
21	temporary address, ¹ Plaintiff filed objections on October 19, 2021. (Doc. 22.) On October 27,	
22	2021, District Judge Dale A. Drozd adopted the Findings and Recommendations in full. (Doc.	
23	23.) Specifically, Judge Drozd denied Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis and ordered	
24	that Plaintiff pay the \$402 filing fee within 90 days. (<i>Id.</i> at 2.) More than 90 days have passed,	
25	and Plaintiff has failed to pay the filing fee.	
26	//	
27		
28	¹ On July 16, 2021, Plaintiff filed a document indicating a temporary change of address to the Los Angeles County Jail. (Doc. 18.) On November 12, 2021, Plaintiff advised he had been transferred back to High Desert State Prison in Susanville, California. (Doc. 25.)	

1 The Local Rules, corresponding with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, provide, 2 "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for 3 the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court." 4 Local Rule 110. "District courts have inherent power to control their dockets" and, in exercising 5 that power, may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. Thompson v. Housing Auth., 6 City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a 7 party's failure to prosecute an action, obey a court order, or comply with local rules. See, e.g., 8 Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with a 9 court order to amend a complaint); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir. 10 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 11 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules). 12 Based on the foregoing, the Court ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause in writing, within 21 days of the date of service of this order, why this action should not be dismissed for his failure to 13 14 comply with the Court's order. Alternatively, within that same time, Plaintiff may pay the \$402 15 filing fee in full. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation that this 16 action be dismissed for failure to obey court orders. 17 IT IS SO ORDERED. 18 Isl Sheila K Oherto Dated: March 14, 2022 19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

27

28

2