

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

VERNON WAYNE MCNEAL,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-05-441 GEB EFB P

vs.

EVERT, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_/

Plaintiff is a prisoner without counsel seeking relief for alleged civil rights violations. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On September 8, 2009, defendants Ginder, McCoy, Chenoweth, Hooven, Chatham, Ervin and Barton filed a notice of renewal of their May 30, 2008 motion for summary judgment. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. Plaintiff has not filed an opposition or a statement of no opposition to the motion for summary judgment.

In cases in which one party is incarcerated and proceeding without counsel, motions ordinarily are submitted on the record without oral argument. Local Rule 78-230(m). “Opposition, if any, to the granting of the motion shall be served and filed with the Clerk by the responding party not more than eighteen (18) days, plus three (3) days for mailing or electronic service, after the date of service of the motion.” *Id.* A responding party’s failure “to file written opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to

1 the granting of the motion and may result in the imposition of sanctions.” *Id.* Furthermore, a  
2 party’s failure to comply with any order or with the Local Rules “may be grounds for imposition  
3 of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.”  
4 Local Rule 11-110. The court may recommend that an action be dismissed with or without  
5 prejudice, as appropriate, if a party disobeys an order or the Local Rules. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*,  
6 963 F.2d 1258, 1263 (9th Cir. 1992) (district court did not abuse discretion in dismissing *pro se*  
7 plaintiff’s complaint for failing to obey an order to re-file an amended complaint to comply with  
8 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988)  
9 (dismissal for *pro se* plaintiff’s failure to comply with local rule regarding notice of change of  
10 address affirmed).

11 On November 15, 2006, the court advised plaintiff of the requirements for filing an  
12 opposition to the motion, that failure to oppose such a motion may be deemed a waiver of  
13 opposition to the motion and that failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in a  
14 recommendation of dismissal.

15 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that, within 20 days of the date of this order,  
16 plaintiff shall file either an opposition to the motion for summary judgment or a statement of no  
17 opposition. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation that this action be  
18 dismissed without prejudice.

19 DATED: October 29, 2009.

20   
EDMUND F. BRENNAN  
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26