

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

RANDY K. HARRIS,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV 2:10cv0483-JAM-JFM (PS)

vs.

HOMEQ SERVICING,

Defendant.

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_ /  
On March 16, 2010, defendant filed a motion to dismiss. On May 25, 2010, the undersigned recommended that this matter be dismissed for plaintiff’s failure to file an opposition. On May 26, 2010, plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time to respond to the motion to dismiss. By order dated June 4, 2010, the undersigned vacated its recommendation that this matter be dismissed and granted plaintiff an extension up to and including June 24, 2010 to file an opposition. Plaintiff has been cautioned that failure to file an opposition would be deemed as a statement of non-opposition to the granting of the motion. Plaintiff has filed no opposition, although court records reflect plaintiff was properly served with notice of the motion and the order granting an extension of time to file opposition at plaintiff’s address of record.

Local Rule 230(1) 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

1 the granting of the motion . . . .” Further, Local Rule 110 provides that failure to comply with  
2 the Local Rules “may be grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or  
3 Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.”

4 By order filed April 27, 2010, plaintiff was advised of the above requirements for  
5 filing opposition under the Local Rules and cautioned that failure to comply with the Local  
6 Rules might result in the imposition of sanctions. In addition, by orders filed May 25, 2010 and  
7 June 4, 2010, plaintiff was again advised of the requirements under the Local Rules, afforded  
8 additional time to file opposition, cautioned that failure to file opposition would be deemed a  
9 statement of nonopposition and would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed.  
10 Plaintiff has again failed to file an opposition. Pursuant to Local Rule 230(1), therefore, the court  
11 deems the failure to file written opposition as a waiver of any opposition to the granting of  
12 defendant’s motion.

13 “Failure to follow a district court’s local rules is a proper ground for dismissal.”  
14 Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995). Pro se litigants are bound by the rules of  
15 procedure, even though pleadings are liberally construed in their favor. King v. Atiyeh, 814 F.2d  
16 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987); Jacobsen v. Filler, 790 F.2d 1362, 1364-65 (9th Cir.1986) .

17 In determining to recommend that this action be dismissed, the court has  
18 considered the five factors set forth in Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53. Plaintiff’s failure to comply with  
19 the Local Rules has impeded the expeditious resolution of the instant litigation and has burdened  
20 the court’s docket, consuming scarce judicial resources in addressing litigation which plaintiff  
21 demonstrates no intention to pursue. Although public policy favors disposition of cases on their  
22 merits, plaintiff’s failure to oppose the pending motion has precluded the court from doing so. In  
23 addition, defendants are prejudiced by the inability to reply to opposition. Finally, the court has  
24 repeatedly advised plaintiff of the requirements under the Local Rules and granted ample  
25 additional time to oppose the pending motion, all to no avail. The court finds no suitable  
26 alternative to dismissal of this action.

1                   Accordingly, IT IS RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed pursuant to  
2 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

3                   These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District  
4 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen  
5 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written  
6 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned  
7 “Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations.” Any reply to the objections  
8 shall be served and filed within fourteen days after service of the objections. The parties are  
9 advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the  
10 District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

11 DATED: July 15, 2010.

12  
13   
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15 /014;harr0483.fsc.noop  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26