

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

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

7 1. The hearing on the County of Sacramento and State of California’s motions to dismiss
8 (ECF Nos. 13, 22) is continued to November 22, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom No. 8.

9 2. The hearing on defendant City of Sacramento’s motion to declare plaintiff a vexatious
10 litigant (ECF No. 9), which is currently set for October 19, 2016, is continued to November 22,
11 2016 at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom No. 8.

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

15 4. Plaintiffs shall file an opposition to the motions, or a statement of non-opposition
16 thereto, no later than November 2, 2016.

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

21 6. Defendants may file a reply to plaintiff’s opposition, if any, on or before November 9,
22 2016.

23 DATED: October 6, 2016.

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