1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7 8	IN THE UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
0 9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	Plaintiff,	No. CIV S-10-0325 JAM EFB PS
12	VS.	
13	ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES OF	
14	SACRAMENTO COUNTY; VERNA MAGNUSON; UNIVERSITY OF	
15	CALIFORNIA DAVIS MEDICAL CENTER; McKINLEY HEALTH CENTER; CITY OF SACRAMENTO	
16	POLICE DEPARTMENT; A. CROSBY; MERCY HOSPITAL; and DOES 1-5,	ORDER AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
17	Defendants.	
18	/	
19	This case is before the undersigned pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule	
20	302(c)(21). See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). On February 8, 2010, plaintiff filed a complaint in this	
21	action and paid the filing fee. Dckt. No. 1. Also on February 8, 2010, the court issued its initial	
22	scheduling order. Dckt. No. 2. That order directed plaintiff to complete service of process	
23	within 120 days (see Federal Rule of Civil Proc	edure ("Rule") 4(m)), and set a scheduling

24 conference for June 9, 2010. The order further directed the parties to file status reports no later

25 than fourteen days prior to the June 9, 2010 scheduling conference (by May 26, 2010), and

26 cautioned the parties that failure to obey the federal or local rules or orders of the court could

1

result in sanctions, including a recommendation that the case be dismissed.

2 The court file reveals that although defendant Adult Protective Services of Sacramento 3 County filed a status report on May 20, 2010, plaintiff has not filed a status report, as required by 4 the February 8, 2010 order. It is also unclear from the court file whether plaintiff has yet 5 effected service of process on any of the other defendants. Accordingly, the status conference will be continued and plaintiff will be ordered to show cause why this case and/or any unserved 6 7 defendants should not be dismissed as a result of plaintiff's failure to follow court orders and, if 8 service has not been effected by June 8, 2010, for plaintiff's failure to effect service of process 9 within the time prescribed by Rule 4(m). Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110 ("Failure of 10 counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds 11 for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the 12 inherent power of the Court."); see also L.R. 183 ("Any individual representing himself or 13 herself without an attorney is bound by the Federal Rules of Civil or Criminal Procedure and by 14 these Local Rules."); Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) ("Failure to follow a 15 district court's local rules is a proper ground for dismissal."). Failure to timely comply with this 16 order may result in sanctions, including a recommendation that this action be dismissed for lack 17 of prosecution.

18

1

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

The status conference currently scheduled for June 9, 2010, is continued to August 11,
2010, at 10:00 a.m., in Courtroom No. 24.

2. Plaintiff shall show cause, in writing, on or before July 21, 2010, why sanctions
should not be imposed for failure to follow court orders and, if service has not been effected by
June 8, 2010, for failure to effect service of process within the time prescribed by Rule 4(m).
////

25 ////

26 ////

1	3. Also by July 21, 2010, the parties shall file status reports (or a joint status report)	
2	setting forth the matters referenced in the court's February 8, 2010 order, including the status of	
3	service of process. ¹	
4	4. Failure of plaintiff to comply with this order may result in the imposition of sanctions,	
5	including a recommendation that this action be dismissed for lack of prosecution. See Fed. R.	
6	Civ. P. 41(b).	
7	DATED: June 2, 2010.	
8	EDMUND F. BRENNAN	
9	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25 26	¹ Because defendant Adult Protective Services of Sacramento County already filed a status report herein, it need not file a further status report or participate in the preparation of a joint status report. However, if defendant Adult Protective Services of Sacramento County elects to file a further status report, it shall do so on or before July 21, 2010.	