1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 DOUGLAS SCOTT McFARLAND, No. 2:16-cv-2568-JAM-EFB P 12 Petitioner. 13 v. **ORDER** 14 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 15 Respondent. 16 17 Petitioner is a state prisoner without counsel seeking a writ of habeas corpus. See 28 18 U.S.C. § 2254. On May 5, 2017, respondent filed a motion to dismiss on the ground that the sole 19 claim in the petition is unexhausted. Petitioner has not filed an opposition or a statement of no 20 opposition to respondent's motion to dismiss. 21 A responding party's failure "to file written opposition or to file a statement of no 22 opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion and may 23 result in the imposition of sanctions." L. R. 230(*l*). Failure to comply with any order or with the 24 Local Rules "may be grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or 25 Rule or within the inherent power of the Court." L. R. 110. The court may dismiss this action 26 with or without prejudice, as appropriate, if a party disobeys an order or the Local Rules. See 27 Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1263 (9th Cir. 1992) (district court did not abuse discretion in 28 dismissing pro se plaintiff's complaint for failing to obey an order to re-file an amended 1

complaint to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for pro se plaintiff's failure to comply with local rule regarding notice of change of address affirmed). Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that, within 21 days of the date of this order, petitioner shall file either an opposition to the motion to dismiss or a statement of no opposition. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed without prejudice. Dated: June 5, 2017. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE