

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

DMITRIY YEGOROV,
Plaintiff,
v.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Defendant.

No. 2:14-cv-03003-TLN-AC

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This matter is before the undersigned pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21). Plaintiff filed his initial complaint on December 30, 2014, along with a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. ECF Nos. 1, 2. Then, on May 13, 2015, plaintiff filed a request for a hearing to subpoena evidence. ECF No. 3. On May 20, 2015, the court granted plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis, denied his motion for a hearing to subpoena evidence, and dismissed his complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. ECF No. 4. The court gave plaintiff thirty (30) days to file an amended complaint. Id. On June 1, 2015, plaintiff filed an "objection"

/////
/////
/////

1 to the court's order, arguing that the court dismissed plaintiff's complaint in error.¹ ECF No. 5.
2 Plaintiff has yet to file an amended complaint.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff shall show cause in writing within
4 fourteen (14) days of the date of this order why this action should not be dismissed pursuant to
5 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute.

6 DATED: July 28, 2015

7 _____
8 /s/ Allison Claire
9 ALLISON CLAIRE
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 _____
24 ¹ Plaintiff's objection is difficult to follow, in part because it contains many incomplete sentences.
25 What can be understood is primarily the assertion of entirely new facts with no clear connection
26 to the complaint, and allegations that this court denied him his constitutional rights by denying his
27 request for a hearing to subpoena evidence. The court is unable to determine exactly what
28 plaintiff is seeking other than, perhaps, the reconsideration of its order dismissing his complaint.
To the extent plaintiff is seeking reconsideration, he has not asserted any new evidence or pointed
to a change in the law that would merit reconsideration. See Local Rule 230(j); Cachil Dehe
Band of Wintun Indians of Colusa Indian Cmty. v. California, 649 F. Supp. 2d 1063, 1069 (E.D.
Cal. 2009).