

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

KEITH EDWARD BROWN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JAMES MATTIS, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-26-JAM-EFB PS  
ORDER AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On May 31, 2017, this case was before the court for a status (pretrial scheduling) conference.<sup>1</sup> Assistant United States Attorney Philip A. Scarborough appeared on behalf of defendants; plaintiff failed to appear.

Local Rule 230(i) provides that “[a]bsent notice of intent to submit the matter on the briefs, failure to appear [at the hearing] . . . may result in the imposition of sanctions.” Failure to comply with the court’s Local Rules or the orders of this court “may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.” E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; *see also Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995)

/////  
/////

<sup>1</sup> This case, in which plaintiff is proceeding *in propria persona*, was referred to the undersigned under Local Rule 302(c)(21). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

1 (“Failure to follow a district court’s local rules is a proper ground for dismissal.”). In light of  
2 plaintiff’s failure to appear, it is hereby ORDERED that:

- 3 1. The status (pretrial scheduling) conference is continued to June 7, 2017.
- 4 2. Plaintiff shall appear at the June 7 hearing to show cause why sanctions should not be  
5 imposed for his failure to appear at the May 31, 2017 hearing.
- 6 3. Failure to comply with this order may result in a recommendation that this action be  
7 dismissed for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

8 DATED: May 31, 2017.

9   
10 EDMUND F. BRENNAN  
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28