

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

JAMES ARMSTEAD,

Plaintiff,

No. 2: 11-cv-1054 JAM KJN P

vs.

TIM V. VIRGA, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

On November 3, 2011, defendants filed a motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). 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 September 22, 2011, plaintiff was advised of the requirements for filing an opposition to a 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 September 22, 2011, plaintiff was also advised 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, to defendants' motion to dismiss.
4 Failure to file an opposition will be deemed as a statement of non-opposition and shall result in a
5 recommendation that this action be dismissed pursuant Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

6 DATED: December 7, 2011

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26


KENDALL J. NEWMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

arm1054.46