

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN DOE, et al.,

NO. CIV. S-06-1043 LKK/DAD

Plaintiff,

v.

O R D E R

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Defendants.

_____ /

On January 7, 2011, the court ordered counsel for plaintiffs to show cause why sanctions should not issue for her failure to timely file plaintiffs' pretrial statements. Doc. No. 149. The court also continued the pretrial conference in this case to February 7, 2011. Id. The response of plaintiffs' counsel to the order to show cause was due on January 14, 2011. No response was filed.

For the foregoing reasons, the court ORDERS as follows:

- (1) Counsel for plaintiff is SANCTIONED in the amount of one hundred and fifty (\$150.00) dollars. This sum shall be

1 paid to the Clerk of the Court no later than thirty (30)
2 days from the date of this order. Counsel shall file an
3 affidavit accompanying the payment of this sanction
4 which states that it is paid personally by counsel, out
5 of personal funds, and is not and will not be billed,
6 directly or indirectly, to the client or in any way made
7 the responsibility of the client as attorneys' fees or
8 costs.

9 (2) The pretrial conference and trial are VACATED.

10 (3) Counsel for plaintiff is FURTHER ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE
11 in writing why this case should not be dismissed as a
12 sanction, in accordance with Local Rule 110, for
13 plaintiffs' failure to respond to the January 7, 2011
14 order to show cause. See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b),
15 Link v. Wabash R.R., 370 U.S. 626, 633 (1962). Counsel
16 shall file a response to this order to show cause no
17 later than January 28, 2011. Failure to timely file a
18 response to the order to show cause will result in
19 dismissal of this action with prejudice.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 DATED: January 21, 2011.

22
23 
24 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON

25 SENIOR JUDGE
26 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT