

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN JORDAN,

Plaintiff,

Civ. No. S-03-1820 LKK KJM P

vs.

CAL TERHUNE, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

On October 21, 2009, defendant Brown filed a motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff has not opposed the motion.

Local Rule 230(1) provides in part: “Failure of the responding party to file written opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion . . . .” On April 25, 2006, plaintiff was advised of the requirements for filing an opposition to the motion and that failure to oppose such a motion may be deemed a waiver of opposition to the motion.

Local Rule 110 provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules “may be grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.” In the order filed April 25, 2006, plaintiff was advised

////

1 that failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be  
2 dismissed.

3 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within thirty days of the  
4 date of this order, plaintiff shall file an opposition, if any he has, to the motion for summary  
5 judgment or a statement of non-opposition. Failure to comply with this order will result in  
6 dismissal of this action be pursuant Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

7 DATED: January 22, 2010.

8   
9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 2/jord1820.46osc  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26