

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

RAJ SINGH<sup>1</sup>,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO,  
Defendant.

No. 2:16-cv-1640 JAM DB PS

ORDER

Plaintiff, Raj Singh, is proceeding in this action pro se. This matter was referred to the undersigned in accordance with Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Plaintiff is proceeding on a third amended complaint filed on June 4, 2018. (ECF No. 20.)

On June 18, 2018, defendant Joyce Thorgrimson filed a motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 21.) That motion is noticed for hearing before the undersigned on August 3, 2018. (ECF No. 22.) Pursuant to Local Rule 230(c) plaintiff was to file opposition or a statement of non-opposition to defendant’s motion “not less than fourteen (14) days preceding the noticed . . . hearing date.” Plaintiff, however, has failed to file a timely opposition or statement of non-opposition.

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff commenced this action under the fictitious name John John. (ECF No. 1.) However, on May 23, 2018, plaintiff’s motion to proceed anonymously was denied and plaintiff was ordered to file a third amended complaint under plaintiff’s true name. (ECF No. 19.) Plaintiff filed a third amended complaint on June 4, 2018, identifying plaintiff’s name as Raj Singh. (ECF No. 20.)

1 The failure of a party to comply with the Local Rules or any order of the court “may be  
2 grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or  
3 within the inherent power of the Court.” Local Rule 110. Any individual representing himself or  
4 herself without an attorney is bound by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules, and  
5 all applicable law. Local Rule 183(a). Failure to comply with applicable rules and law may be  
6 grounds for dismissal or any other sanction appropriate under the Local Rules. Id.

7 In light of plaintiff’s pro se status, and in the interests of justice, the court will provide  
8 plaintiff with an opportunity to show good cause for plaintiff’s conduct along with a final  
9 opportunity to oppose defendant’s motion.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:


11 1. Plaintiff show cause in writing within fourteen days of the date of this order as to why  
12 this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution<sup>2</sup>;

13 2. The August 3, 2018 hearing of defendant’s motion to dismiss (ECF No. 21) is  
14 continued to **Friday, August 24, 2018, at 10:00 a.m.**, at the United States District Court, 501 I  
15 Street, Sacramento, California, in Courtroom No. 27, before the undersigned;

16 3. On or before **August 10, 2018**, plaintiff shall file a statement of opposition or non-  
17 opposition to defendant’s motion to dismiss; and

18 4. Plaintiff is cautioned that the failure to timely comply with this order may result in a  
19 recommendation that this case be dismissed.

20 Dated: July 30, 2018

21  
22  
23   
DEBORAH BARNES  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

24 DLB:6  
25 DB/orders/orders.pro se/sing1640.osc.cont.hrg.ord

26  
27 <sup>2</sup> Alternatively, if plaintiff no longer wishes to pursue this civil action, plaintiff may comply with  
28 this order by filing a request for voluntary dismissal pursuant to Rule 41(a) of the Federal Rules  
of Civil Procedure.