

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 TROY HAYLES,

11 Plaintiff,

No. 2: 09-cv-3061 JFM (PC)

12 vs.

13 DR. ERICA WHEATHERFORD, et al.,

14 Defendants.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 On October 23, 2012, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment pursuant
17 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56. Plaintiff has not opposed the motion.

18 Local Rule 230(l) provides in part: “Failure of the responding party to file written
19 opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to
20 the granting of the motion” On December 23, 2009, plaintiff was advised of the
21 requirements for filing an opposition to the motion and that failure to oppose such a motion may
22 be deemed a waiver of opposition to the motion. (See Dkt. No. 17 at p. 4-5.) Plaintiff was
23 readvised of these requirements on October 23, 2012 by defendants. (See Dkt. No. 61 at p. 3.)

24 Local Rule 110 provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules “may be
25 grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the
26 inherent power of the Court.” In the order filed December 23, 2009 and in defendants’ motion

1 for summary judgment filed October 23, 2012, plaintiff was advised that failure to comply with
2 the Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed.

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

8 DATED: November 29, 2012.

9
10 
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12 14
13 hayl3061.46.osc
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26