## 

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

	<b>DEADLINE: MAY 20, 2024</b>
Defendants.	(ECF No. 5)
v. GREG RODRIGUEZ, et al.,	CAUSE IN WRITING WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT ISSUE FOR FAILURE TO FILE NOTICE WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED
Plaintiff,	ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW
ZENAIDA CORDOVA,	Case No. 1:24-cv-00482-JLT-SAB

On April 23, 2024, Plaintiff filed a complaint in this action against Defendants Greg Rodriguez and Michael Pallares. (ECF No. 1.) The Court's review of the complaint suggests that this case may be related to other actions pending in this district. On April 26, 2024, the Court issued an order requiring Plaintiff to comply with Local Rule 123 and file a notice of related cases or, alternatively, a notice explaining why the action should not be related no later than May 10, 2024. (ECF No. 5.) The deadline has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed the required notice nor requested an extension of time to do so.

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 ... within the inherent power of the Court." The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate,

including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles Cnty., 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000). The Court shall require Plaintiff to show cause why sanctions should not issue for the failure to notify the Court whether this case should be related in compliance with the Court's

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- Plaintiff shall show cause in writing no later than May 20, 2024, why sanctions should not issue for failure to file a notice of related cases or a notice explaining why the action should not be related by the deadline as required by the Court's
- Failure to comply with this order will result in the issuance of sanctions.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE