

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

ROOSEVELT FRANKLIN,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-1147 MCE JFM (PC)

vs.

MIKE MCDONALD, Warden, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

On February 25, 2011, defendants filed a motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b). 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 December 2, 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.

Local Rule 110 provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules “may be grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.” In the order filed December 2, 2010], plaintiff was advised

////

1 that failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be
2 dismissed.

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

7 DATED: April 7, 2011.

8
9 
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 /014;fran1147.46o
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26