

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SCOTT JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

KARL VUONG, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-00709-KJM-DB

ORDER

Pro se defendant Karl Vuong is the only defendant remaining in this case. He has been non-responsive for over a year. *See, e.g.*, Pl.’s Ex Parte Application, Dec. 1, 2016, ECF 55 (noting defendant Vuong has been entirely unresponsive to requests to finalize settlement agreement from May of 2016); Mins. Status Conf., Mar. 16, 2017, ECF No. 62 (noting defendant Vuong’s non-appearance and his non-response to parties’ efforts to contact him); Rule 26 Report, (“Defendant Karl Vuong did not participate in the drafting of this settlement report. This draft was sent to Defendant Karl Vuong and was not returned despite phone calls.”); Pl.’s Notice of Mot. to Dismiss, April 12, 2017, ECF No. 66 (“Defendant Vuong has been entirely non-responsive on this and every other issue.”); Order August 10, 2017, ECF No. 71 (sanctioning defendant Vuong for his non-response to an April 12, 2017 order to show cause).


Given that defendant Vuong is the only remaining defendant and he has been non-responsive for over a year, and also that plaintiff has not sought clerk’s entry of default against

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

him to them move for default judgment, plaintiff is hereby ORDERED to show cause within seven days why the court should not dismiss this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 10, 2017.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE