

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

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

JOHN KENT,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:09-cv-02905 FCD KJN PS

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CONSUMER AFFAIRS,
CONTRACTORS STATE LICENSE
BOARD, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

On November 30, 2010, the following defendants filed a motion to dismiss plaintiff's Ninth Amended Complaint pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b): Kevin Carr, Thomas Ebling, Jim Kleiman, Rick Lopez, Patricia Nelson, Sue Payne, Diana Roach, Anita Sisneros, Sue Stirewalt, Stephen Takimoto, Carl Vega, Rick Villucci, and Leslie Yocum-Howell. (the "Moving Defendants")¹ (Dkt. No. 28.) The Moving Defendants noticed their motion to dismiss for a hearing to take place before the undersigned on January 13, 2011. Pursuant to this court's Local Rules, plaintiff was obligated to file and serve a written opposition or statement of non-opposition to the Moving Defendants' motion at least fourteen days prior to the hearing date,

¹ This action proceeds before the undersigned pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

1 or by December 30, 2010. See E. Dist. Local Rule 230(c).² The court’s docket reveals that
2 plaintiff, who is proceeding without counsel, failed to file a written opposition or statement of
3 non-opposition with respect to the Moving Defendants’ motion to dismiss.

4 Eastern District Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to
5 comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the
6 Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the
7 Court.” Moreover, Eastern District Local Rule 183(a) provides, in part:

8 Any individual representing himself or herself without an attorney is
9 bound by the Federal Rules of Civil or Criminal Procedure, these Rules,
10 and all other applicable law. All obligations placed on “counsel” by these
11 Rules apply to individuals appearing in propria persona. Failure to comply
12 therewith may be ground for dismissal . . . or any other sanction
13 appropriate under these Rules.

14 See also King v. Atiyeh, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987) (“Pro se litigants must follow the
15 same rules of procedure that govern other litigants.”). Case law is in accord that a district court
16 may impose sanctions, *including involuntary dismissal of a plaintiff’s case* pursuant to Federal
17 Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), where that plaintiff fails to prosecute his or her case or fails to
18 comply with the court’s orders, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or the court’s local rules.³

19 See Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 44 (1991) (recognizing that a court “may act *sua*

20 ² Eastern District Local Rule 230(c) provides:

21 **(c) Opposition and Non-Opposition.** Opposition, if any, to the granting
22 of the motion shall be in writing and shall be filed and served not less than
23 fourteen (14) days preceding the noticed (or continued) hearing date. A
24 responding party who has no opposition to the granting of the motion shall
25 serve and file a statement to that effect, specifically designating the motion
26 in question. No party will be entitled to be heard in opposition to a motion
at oral arguments if opposition to the motion has not been timely filed by
that party. . . .

³ The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals had held that under certain circumstances a district
court does not abuse its discretion by dismissing a plaintiff’s case pursuant to Federal Rule of
Civil Procedure 41(b) for failing to file an opposition to a motion to dismiss. See, e.g., Trice v.
Clark County Sch. Dist., 376 Fed. Appx. 789, 790 (9th Cir. 2010).

1 *sponte* to dismiss a suit for failure to prosecute”); Hells Canyon Preservation Council v. U.S.
2 Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005) (stating that courts may dismiss an action
3 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) *sua sponte* for a plaintiff’s failure to prosecute
4 or comply with the rules of civil procedure or the court’s orders); Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52,
5 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam) (“Failure to follow a district court’s local rules is a proper ground
6 for dismissal.”); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992) (“Pursuant to Federal
7 Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), the district court may dismiss an action for failure to comply with
8 any order of the court.”); Thompson v. Housing Auth. of City of L.A., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th
9 Cir. 1986) (per curiam) (stating that district courts have inherent power to control their dockets
10 and may impose sanctions including dismissal).

11 In light of the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

12 1. The hearing on the Moving Defendants’ motion to dismiss plaintiff’s
13 Ninth Amended Complaint (Dkt. No. 28), which is presently set for January 13, 2011, is
14 continued until February 17, 2011.

15 2. Plaintiff shall file a written opposition to the motion to dismiss, or a
16 statement of non-opposition thereto, on or before January 20, 2011. *Plaintiff’s failure to file a*
17 *written opposition will be deemed a statement of non-opposition to the pending motion and*
18 *consent to the granting of the motion to dismiss, and shall constitute an additional ground for the*
19 *imposition of appropriate sanctions, including a recommendation that plaintiff’s case be*
20 *involuntarily dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).*

21 3. The Moving Defendants may file a written reply to plaintiff’s opposition,
22 if any, on or before February 3, 2010.

23 ///

24 ///


25 ///

26

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 4, 2011


KENDALL J. NEWMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE