## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTHONY JULIAN BARRAZA, No. CIV S-09-1050-CMK

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs. <u>ORDER</u>

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

Plaintiff, who is proceeding with retained counsel, brings this action for judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). Pursuant to the court's scheduling order, plaintiff was required to prosecute this action by either seeking voluntary remand or filing a dispositive motion within 45 days from the date of service of the administrative record by defendant. Plaintiff was warned that failure to comply may result in dismissal of this action for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders. See Local Rule 110.

A review of the docket reflects that the answer and certified administrative record were served on August 28, 2009. Plaintiff obtained four stipulations, which were approved by the court, extending the time in which he was to file his dispositive motion up to an including

April 12, 2010. In approving the third extension, the court cautioned Plaintiff that further extensions were discouraged. In approving the fourth extension, the court warned Plaintiff no further extensions of time would be permitted. To date, plaintiff has not filed a dispositive motion.

Plaintiff shall show cause in writing, within 14 days of the date of this order, why this action should not be dismissed for failure to file a dispositive motion. Plaintiff is again warned that failure to respond to this order may result in dismissal of the action for the reasons outlined above, as well as for failure to prosecute and comply with court rules and orders. See id. IT IS SO ORDERED.

II IS SO ONDERED

DATED: May 6, 2010

CRAIGM. KELLISON

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE