1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	CESARE REDMOND,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-07-0021 MCE EFB P
12	VS.
13	W.A. RODRIGUEZ, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
16	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42
17	U.S.C. § 1983. On October 15, 2010, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment pursuant
18	to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. Plaintiff has not opposed the motion. ¹
19	A responding party's failure "to file written opposition or to file a statement of no
20	opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion and may
21	result in the imposition of sanctions." L. R. 230(1). Failure to comply with any order or with the
22	Local Rules "may be grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or
23	Rule or within the inherent power of the Court." L. R. 110. The court may recommend this
24	action be dismissed with or without prejudice, as appropriate, if plaintiff disobeys an order or the
25	1 Disintiff is well aware of his shiization to file on annexitien to the metion of his shiization to file on annexitien to the metion of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his shiization to file on a new statemeters and the section of his sectio
26	¹ Plaintiff is well aware of his obligation to file an opposition to the motion as evidenced by his November 23, 2010 motion for an extension of time to file an opposition.

Local Rules. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1252 (9th Cir. 1992) (district court did not
 abuse discretion in dismissing *pro se* plaintiff's complaint for failing to obey an order to re-file
 an amended complaint to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure); *Carey v. King*, 856
 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for *pro se* plaintiff's failure to comply with local
 rule regarding notice of change of address affirmed);

On February 25, 2010, the court advised plaintiff of the requirements for filing an
opposition to the motion, that failure to oppose such a motion may be deemed a waiver of
opposition to the motion, and that failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in a
recommendation of dismissal.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that, within twenty-one days of the date of this
order, plaintiff shall file either an opposition to the motion for summary judgment or a statement
of non-opposition. Given the extension of time already granted, the court is not inclined to grant
any further extensions of time. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation
that this action be dismissed without prejudice.

DATED: January 28, 2011.

Biema

EDMUND F. BRENNAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE