1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	TONI ELMORE,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-07-1463 WBS EFB P
12	VS.
13	ARONG, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
15	·/
16	Plaintiff is a prisoner without counsel seeking relief for alleged civil rights violations.
17	See 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On September 11, 2009, defendants Maxham, Moreno, Rendon, and
18	Perfino filed a motion for summary judgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. Plaintiff has not filed an
19	opposition or a statement of no opposition to the motion for summary judgment.
20	In cases in which one party is incarcerated and proceeding without counsel, motions
21	ordinarily are submitted on the record without oral argument. Local Rule 78-230(m).
22	"Opposition, if any, to the granting of the motion shall be served and filed with the Clerk by the
23	responding party not more than eighteen (18) days, plus three (3) days for mailing or electronic
24	service, after the date of service of the motion." Id. A responding party's failure "to file written
25	opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to
26	the granting of the motion and may result in the imposition of sanctions." Id. Furthermore, a

1

1 party's failure to comply with any order or with the Local Rules "may be grounds for imposition 2 of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court." 3 Local Rule 11-110. The court may recommend that an action be dismissed with or without 4 prejudice, as appropriate, if a party disobeys an order or the Local Rules. See Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 5 963 F.2d 1258, 1263 (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 6 7 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 8 9 address affirmed).

On November 19, 2008, 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 20 days of the date of this order,
plaintiff shall file either an opposition to the motion for summary judgment or a statement of no
opposition. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation that this action be

17 dismissed without prejudice.

18 DATED: October 29, 2009.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

EĎMUND F. BRĖNNAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE