

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
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA

BRYN RAU,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:13-cv-00371-KJM-CMK

vs.

MISSION RANCH PRIMARY CARE;
MARCIA F. NELSON,

Defendants.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

_____ /

On July 31, 2013 the court issued plaintiff’s counsel an order to show cause why she should not be sanctioned for failure to prosecute. (ECF 15.) The court issued the order because plaintiff had not filed an amended complaint, as ordered, within twenty-one days of this court’s order on defendants’ motion to dismiss. (ECF 12.) While the July 31, 2013 order to show cause incorrectly requested plaintiff to respond the same day the order was docketed, rather than direct plaintiff to respond within this court’s customary seven-day time frame, plaintiff’s counsel still has not responded some three weeks later.

So that the record is clear, the court now orders plaintiff’s counsel to show cause why she should not be sanctioned in the amount of \$250 for not complying with this court’s repeated orders to file an amended complaint. Plaintiff’s counsel shall respond within **seven days** of the date of this order. If plaintiff’s counsel does not comply with this order, the court

1 additionally may report plaintiff's counsel to the State Bar and dismiss this action for failure to
2 prosecute.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: August 27, 2013.

5
6 
7 _____
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28