

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

K. JAMEL WALKER, Plaintiff, v. CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, et al., Defendants.	No. 2:09-cv-0569 WBS KJN P <u>ORDER</u>
---	--

On March 6, 2015 defendants filed a motion for summary judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56. (ECF No. 60.) Plaintiff has not opposed the motion.


Local Rule 230(l) 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 September 14, 2012, 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. (ECF No. 38.) In addition, defendants’ motion for summary judgment includes the notice to plaintiff required under Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc).

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

1 the Court.” In the order filed September 14, 2012, plaintiff was advised that failure to comply
2 with the Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed.

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

7 Dated: July 1, 2015

8 
9 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 /walk0569.46.osc
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28