

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

MICHAEL MARTINEZ,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-0090 JFM (PC)

vs.

CHRISTOPHER MILLS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding before the undersigned with the consent of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). See Consents filed February 16, 2010 and June 17, 2010.

On February 4, 2011, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56. Plaintiff has not opposed the motion.

Local Rule 230(l) 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 March 31, 2010, plaintiff was advised of the requirements for filing an opposition to the motion and that failure to oppose such a motion may be deemed a waiver of opposition to the motion.

////

1 Local Rule 110 provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules “may be
2 grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the
3 inherent power of the Court.” In the order filed March 31, 2010, plaintiff was advised that
4 failure to comply with the Local Rules might result in the dismissal of this action.

5 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within thirty days of the
6 date of this order, plaintiff shall file an opposition, if any he has, to the motion for summary
7 judgment or a statement of non-opposition. Failure to comply with this order will
8 result in dismissal of this action pursuant Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

9 DATED: March 15, 2011.

10
11 
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

13 12
14 mart0090.46osc