(SS) Bailey v	v. Commissioner of Social Security	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE U	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ALISHA BAILEY,	No. 2:15-CV-0153-CMK
12	Plaintiff,	
13	vs.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,	
15	Defendant.	
16	Defendant.	
17		
18	Plaintiff, who is p	roceeding with retained counsel, brings this action under
19	42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security.	
20	A review of the docket reflects that defendant has notified the court regarding consent to proceed	
21	before a Magistrate Judge (see Doc. 7). Plaintiff, however, has not notified the court regarding	
22	consent. Pursuant to the court's scheduling order and Eastern District of California Local Rules,	
23	Appendix A, the time to do so has now expired.	
24	///	
25	///	
26	///	
		1
		Deale

Doc. 14

Plaintiff shall show cause in writing, within 30 days of the date of this order, why this action should not be dismissed for failure to inform the court regarding consent to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction, as required by the court's scheduling order. Submission of a completed consent election form shall constitute a sufficient response. The Clerk of the Court is directed to serve on plaintiff a copy of the court's form entitled "Consent to Assignment or Request for Reassignment." Plaintiff is warned that failure to respond to this order may result in the dismissal of the action for the reasons discussed above, as well as for failure to prosecute and comply with court rules and orders. See Local Rule 110.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 20, 2016

CRAIGM. KELLISON

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE