

1 of sanctions.” *Id.* Furthermore, a party’s failure to comply with any order or with the Local
2 Rules “may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute
3 or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.” E.D. Cal. Local Rule 110. The court may
4 recommend that an action be dismissed with or without prejudice, as appropriate, if a party
5 disobeys an order or the Local Rules. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1263 (9th Cir.
6 1992) (district court did not abuse discretion in dismissing pro se plaintiff’s complaint for failing
7 to obey an order to re-file an amended complaint to comply with Federal Rules of Civil
8 Procedure); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for pro se
9 plaintiff’s failure to comply with local rule regarding notice of change of address affirmed).

10 On January 17, 2019, the court advised plaintiff of the requirements for filing an
11 opposition to the motion, that failure to oppose such a motion may be deemed a waiver of
12 opposition to the motion and that failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in dismissal.
13 ECF No. 16.

14 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that, within 21 days of the date of this order,
15 plaintiff shall file either an opposition to the motion or a statement of no opposition. Failure to
16 comply with this order may result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed without
17 prejudice.

18 DATED: February 13, 2020.

19 
20 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28