

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 THOMAS JACKSON, EMMA JACKSON,  
12 TJ AUTO BODY SERVICES, INC.,  
13 dba "TJ ENTERPRISES",,

13

Plaintiffs,

14

v.

15

16

17

18

FARMERS INSURANCE EXCHANGE,  
TRUCK INSURANCE EXCHANGE,  
BRUCE H. BAILEY, JAMES  
GILLIS, and STEVE EASON,

19

Defendants.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

A status conference had previously been set herein on April 7, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. By request of the plaintiffs, it was continued to June 2, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. In the order granting the continuance, the court directed the parties to file their status reports fourteen (14) days prior to the status conference. (ECF No. 7.)

Plaintiffs have failed to file a status report. It is also unclear whether defendants Farmers Insurance Exchange, Truck Insurance Exchange, Bruce H. Bailey, James Gillis, and Steven

1 Eason have been served, as no proof of service has been filed,  
2 none of the defendants has yet made an appearance, and no  
3 attorney of record for any defendant is registered with the  
4 court's Electronic Case Filing system.

5 In light of the foregoing, the court hereby orders as  
6 follows:


7 [1] Counsel for plaintiffs is hereby ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE  
8 in writing, within seven (7) days of docketing of this  
9 order, as to why sanctions, including a fine of \$250  
10 and potentially including dismissal of this action with  
11 prejudice,<sup>1</sup> should not issue in accordance with Local  
12 Rule 110.

13 [2] The status conference herein, currently set for June 2,  
14 2014 at 1:30 p.m., is CONTINUED to August 4, 2014 at  
15 3:00 p.m. Parties are to file status reports fourteen  
16 (14) days prior to the status conference.

17 [3] Plaintiffs are DIRECTED to serve defendants with  
18 process and a copy of this order no later than twenty-  
19 one (21) days from the date this order is docketed.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 DATED: May 29, 2014.

22   
23 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON  
24 SENIOR JUDGE  
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

26 <sup>1</sup> See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Link v. Wabash R.R., 370 U.S. 626,  
27 633 (1962) ("[W]hen circumstances make such action appropriate, a  
28 District Court may dismiss a complaint for failure to prosecute  
even without affording notice of its intention to do so or  
providing an adversary hearing before acting.").