1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 JAMES WILKERSON, No. 2:12-cv-2251 AC P 12 Plaintiff. 13 **ORDER** v. 14 G. NIES, WARDEN, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 On June 27, 2013 defendants filed a motion to dismiss pursuant to non-enumerated Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b) and under Fed. R. Civ. 12(b)(6). ECF No. 27. Plaintiff has 18 19 not opposed the motion. 20 Local Rule 230(1) provides in part: "Failure of the responding party to file written 21 opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to 22 the granting of the motion " On January 8, 2013 plaintiff was advised of the requirements for 23 filing an opposition to the motion and that failure to oppose such a motion may be deemed a 24 waiver of opposition to the motion. ECF No. 15. Defendants have also provided notice pursuant 25 to Woods v. Carey, 684 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2012), with respect to that portion of the motion 26 brought pursuant to non-enumerated Rule 12(b). See ECF No. 27-5. 27 Local Rule 110 provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules "may be grounds for 28 imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of 1

the Court." In the order filed January 8, 2013 (ECF No. 15), plaintiff was advised that failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed. Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within thirty days of the date of this order, plaintiff shall file an opposition, if any, to the motion to dismiss. Failure to file an opposition will be deemed as a statement of non-opposition and shall result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed pursuant Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). DATED: August 7, 2013 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE AC:009/dd wilk2251.46.osc