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

CHRISTOPHER SCOTT RIDER,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-09-2675 FCD DAD P

VS.

13 M.R. GOLDY et al.,

|

Defendants.

On February 11, 2011, defendants Goldy and Schwab filed a motion to have plaintiff declared a vexatious litigant, revoke plaintiff's IFP status, and dismiss plaintiff's second amended complaint or require him to pay a filing fee. Plaintiff has not opposed the motion.¹

ORDER

Local Rule 230(1) 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 October 27, 2010, plaintiff was advised of the requirements for filing an opposition to a motion and that failure to oppose such a motion may be deemed a waiver of opposition to the motion.

¹ If plaintiff no longer wishes to proceed with this matter, he should file a request to dismiss this action without prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

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 the Court." In the order filed October 27, 2010, plaintiff was advised that failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed.

Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within thirty days of the date of this order, plaintiff shall file an opposition, if any, to defendants' motion to have plaintiff declared a vexatious litigant, revoke plaintiff's IFP status, and dismiss plaintiff's second amended complaint or require him to pay a filing fee. Failure to file an opposition will be deemed as a statement of non-opposition and shall result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed pursuant Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: March 9, 2011.

DAD:9 ride2675.46