| 1  |  |                        |
|----|--|------------------------|
| 2  |  |                        |
| 3  |  |                        |
| 4  |  |                        |
| 5  |  |                        |
| 6  |  |                        |
| 7  |  |                        |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |                        |
| 9  | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |                        |
| 10 |  |                        |
| 11 | KRISTI VERMA, et al.   | No. 13-cv-00865-MCE-DB |
| 12 | Plaintiffs,  |                        |
| 13 | ٧.   | ORDER                  |
| 14 | EFRAT OKEV, et al.   |                        |
| 15 | Defendants.  |                        |
| 16 |  |                        |
| 17 | On September 26, 2016, the Court, in review of the case docket, ordered Plaintiff            |                        |
| 18 | Zentek Corporation to obtain counsel and to file a status report regarding the status of its |                        |
| 19 | current representation no later than October 11, 2016. ECF No. 87. On September 30,          |                        |
| 20 | 2016, Defendants Efrat Okev, Lloyd Burton, and Augzenta, Inc. filed a Motion to              |                        |
| 21 | (1) Dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint For Failure to Comply With Court Orders or (2) to          |                        |
| 22 | Preclude Plaintiffs From Offering Evidence. ECF No. 88. Plaintiff Zentek Corporation         |                        |
| 23 | has failed to respond to the Court's September 26 Order, and all Plaintiffs have failed to   |                        |
| 24 | file an Opposition or Statement of Non-Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, as       |                        |
| 25 | required under Eastern District of California Local Rule 230(c). The Court on                |                        |
| 26 | October 13, 2016 thus issued an order that all Plaintiffs show cause in writing by October   |                        |
| 27 | 24, 2016 as to why the case should not be dismissed with prejudice, to which Plaintiffs      |                        |
| 28 | have failed to respond. ECF No. 89.  | 1                      |
|    |  | 1                      |

| 1  | The Court thus Orders that Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint be DISMISSED |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | with prejudice. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.      |  |
| 3  | IT IS SO ORDERED.   |  |
| 4  | Dated: November 22, 2016  |  |
| 5  | MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR   |  |
| 6  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  |  |
| 7  |   |  |
| 8  |   |  |
| 9  |   |  |
| 10 |   |  |
| 11 |   |  |
| 12 |   |  |
| 13 |   |  |
| 14 |   |  |
| 15 |   |  |
| 16 |   |  |
| 17 |   |  |
| 18 |   |  |
| 19 |   |  |
| 20 |   |  |
| 21 |   |  |
| 22 |   |  |
| 23 |   |  |
| 24 |   |  |
| 25 |   |  |
| 26 |   |  |
| 27 |   |  |
| 28 |   |  |
|    | 2   |  |