

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 RICARDO VALDEZ,

No. 2:12-cv-2867-TLN-EFB P

11 Plaintiff,

12 ORDER

13 MATTHEW CATE, et al.,

14 Defendants.

15
16 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42
17 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 6, 2013, defendants filed a motion to dismiss for failure to exhaust
18 administrative remedies and/or failure to state a claim and informed plaintiff of the requirements
19 for opposing such a motion. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b) & (b)(6); Stratton v. Buck*, 697 F.3d 1004,
20 1008 (9th Cir. 2012); *Wyatt v. Terhune*, 315 F.3d 1108, 1115, 1120 n.15 (9th Cir. 2003). The
21 time for acting has passed, and plaintiff has not filed an opposition or otherwise responded to the
22 motion.

23 In cases in which one party is incarcerated and proceeding without counsel, motions
24 ordinarily are submitted on the record without oral argument. Local Rule 230(l). “Opposition, if
25 any, to the granting of the motion shall be served and filed by the responding party not more than
26 twenty-one (21), days after the date of service of the motion.” *Id.* A responding party’s failure
27 “to file an opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any
28 opposition to the granting of the motion and may result in the imposition of sanctions.” *Id.*

1 Furthermore, a party's failure to comply with any order or with the Local Rules "may be
2 grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or
3 within the inherent power of the Court." Local Rule 110. The court may recommend that an
4 action be dismissed with or without prejudice, as appropriate, if a party disobeys an order or the
5 Local Rules. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1263 (9th Cir. 1992) (district court did not
6 abuse discretion in dismissing pro se plaintiff's complaint for failing to obey an order to re-file an
7 amended complaint to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d
8 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for pro se plaintiff's failure to comply with local rule
9 regarding notice of change of address affirmed).

10 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that, within 21 days of the date of this order,
11 plaintiff shall file either an opposition to the motion to dismiss or a statement of no opposition.
12 Failure to comply with this order may result in this action being dismissed without prejudice.

13 Dated: January 2, 2014.

14 
15 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28