

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

RUSSEL BRUCE CLARK,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
WARDEN, FCI MENDOTA,  
Respondent.

Case No. 1:24-cv-00211-SAB-HC  
ORDER DIRECTING RESPONDENT TO  
FILE RESPONSE TO PETITION  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY  
SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED

Petitioner is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

On February 27, 2024, the Court ordered Respondent to file a response to the petition. (ECF No. 5.) On April 30, 2024, the Court granted Respondent until May 29, 2024, to file a response. (ECF No. 9.) To date, Respondent has failed to file a response to the petition.

Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.” L.R. 110.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Within seven (7) days of the date of service of this order, Respondent shall file a response to the petition; and

///

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

2. Within seven (7) days of the date of service of this order, Respondent shall show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for failure to comply with this Court's orders.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 4, 2024



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE