1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 CHARLES CORTEMANCHE, No. 2:12-cv-2788 AC P 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. **ORDER** 14 B. MERRIWEATHER, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 On April 3, 2014, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment pursuant to Federal 18 Rule of Civil Procedure 56. ECF No. 18. Plaintiff has not opposed the motion. 19 Local Rule 230(1) provides in part: "Failure of the responding party to file written 20 opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to 21 the granting of the motion . . . . " By Order, ECF No. 11, filed on June 27, 2013, plaintiff was 22 advised of the requirements for filing an opposition to the motion and that failure to oppose such 23 a motion may be deemed a waiver of opposition to the motion. See Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 24 952, 957 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc), cert. denied, 527 U.S. 1035 (1999); Klingele v. Eikenberry, 25 849 F.2d 409 (9th Cir. 1988). In addition, defendants provided the concurrent Rand notice, ECF 26 No. 18-4, required by Woods v. Carey, 684 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2012), setting forth the 27 requirements to oppose a motion for summary judgment. 28 Local Rule 110 provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules "may be grounds for 1

| 1  | imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of     |
|----|---|
| 2  | the Court." In the order filed June 27, 2013, plaintiff was advised that failure to comply with the   |
| 3  | Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed. The Ninth Circuit has        |
| 4  | recently held that a district court is prohibited from granting a summary judgment motion solely      |
| 5  | based on a failure to oppose the motion notwithstanding any local rule suggesting otherwise.          |
| 6  | Heinemann v. Satterberg, 731 F. 3d 914, 916 (9th Cir. 2013). Nevertheless, a "failure to respond      |
| 7  | to a fact asserted in the motion permits a court to 'consider the fact undisputed for purposes of the |
| 8  | motion." <u>Id.</u> at 917 ( <u>quoting</u> Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e)(2)).                                |
| 9  | Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within thirty days of the date of                    |
| 10 | this order, plaintiff shall file an opposition, if any, to defendants' motion for summary judgment.   |
| 11 | Failure to file an opposition, properly addressing defendants' assertions of fact, will result in the |
| 12 | facts asserted by the motion to be considered by the court as undisputed for purposes of              |
| 13 | adjudicating the motion.  |
| 14 | DATED: May 13, 2014   |
| 15 | ALLISON CLAIRE  |
| 16 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  |
| 17 |   |
| 18 |   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 |   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |
| 26 |   |
| 27 |   |
| 28 |   |