

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 DANIEL P. BJORLIN,

11 Plaintiff,

No. 2: 10-cv-2162 FCD KJN P

12 vs.

13 DR. MORROW, et al.,

14 Defendants.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 On June 27, 2011, defendants filed a motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule
17 of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and 12(b). Plaintiff has not opposed the motion.


18 Local Rule 230(l) provides in part: “Failure of the responding party to file written
19 opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to
20 the granting of the motion” On February 2, 2011, plaintiff was advised of the requirements
21 for filing an opposition to the motion and that failure to oppose such a motion may be deemed a
22 waiver of opposition to the motion.

23 Local Rule 110 provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules “may be
24 grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the
25 inherent power of the Court.” In the order filed February 2, 2011, plaintiff was advised
26 that failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be

1 dismissed.

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

6 DATED: August 9, 2011

7
8 
9 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 bj2162.osc
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26