

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

RENEE L. MARTIN,  
  
                                Plaintiffs,  
  
                                v.  
  
AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE  
ASSOCIATION OF NORTHERN  
CALIFORNIA NEVADA AND UTAH, et  
al.,  
  
                                Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-2496-TLN-EFB PS

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On July 29, 2016, defendant CSAA Insurance Exchange filed a motion to dismiss this action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and 12(b)(1), and noticed the motion for hearing on September 14, 2016. ECF No. 22. Court records reflect that plaintiff has not filed an opposition or statement of non-opposition to the motion.

Local Rule 230(c) provides that opposition to the granting of a motion, or a statement of non-opposition thereto, must be served upon the moving party, and filed with this court, no later than fourteen days preceding the noticed hearing date or, in this instance, by August 31, 2016. Local Rule 230(c) further provides that “[n]o party will be entitled to be heard in opposition to a motion at oral arguments if opposition to the motion has not been timely filed by that party.” Local Rule 183, governing persons appearing in pro se, provides that failure to comply with the

1 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules may be grounds for dismissal, judgment by  
2 default, or other appropriate sanctions. Local Rule 110 provides that failure to comply with the  
3 Local Rules “may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by  
4 statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.” *See also Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d  
5 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (“Failure to follow a district court’s local rules is a proper ground for  
6 dismissal.”). Pro se litigants are bound by the rules of procedure, even though pleadings are  
7 liberally construed in their favor. *King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987).

8 Accordingly, good cause appearing, it is hereby ORDERED that:

9 1. The hearing on defendant’s motion to dismiss (ECF No. 22) is continued to October  
10 12, 2016.

11 2. Plaintiff shall show cause, in writing, no later than September 28, 2016, why sanctions  
12 should not be imposed for failure to timely file an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to  
13 the pending motion.

14 3. Plaintiff shall file an opposition to the motion, or a statement of non-opposition thereto,  
15 no later than September 28, 2016.

16 4. Failure of to file an opposition to the motion will be deemed a statement of non-  
17 opposition thereto, and may result in a recommendation that this this action be dismissed for lack  
18 of prosecution and/or for failure to comply with court orders and this court’s Local Rules. *See*  
19 *Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)*.

20 5. Defendant may file a reply to plaintiff’s opposition, if any, on or before October 5,  
21 2016.

22 DATED: September 7, 2016.

23   
24 EDMUND F. BRENNAN  
25 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
26  
27  
28