1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	TIMOTHY JOE OSBORNE,
11	Petitioner, No. 2:09-cv-3594 FCD KJN P
12	VS.
13	MATTHEW CATE,
14	Respondent. <u>ORDER</u>
15	
16	Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel with an application for
17	writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On July 2, 2010, respondent filed a motion
18	to dismiss this action pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases. Petitioner has not
19	filed an opposition to the motion and the time for doing so has expired. Local Rule 230(<i>l</i>)
20	provides in part: "Failure of the responding party to file written opposition or to file a statement
21	of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion"
22	Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner shall show
23	cause in writing, within twenty-one days, why his failure to oppose respondent's July 2, 2010
24	motion to dismiss should not be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion,
25	and shall file such opposition. Failure to respond to this order, or to file an opposition to the
26	
	1

(HC) Osborne v. Cate

Doc. 16

pending motion to dismiss, will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. SO ORDERED. DATED: November 4, 2010 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE osbo3594.osc.no.oppo.