

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

TERRENCE VAIL,
Plaintiff,
v.
CITY OF SACRAMENTO,
Defendant.

No. 2:16-cv-2673 DB PS

ORDER

By order signed February 6, 2018, plaintiff’s complaint was dismissed and plaintiff was granted leave to file an amended complaint that cured the defects noted in that order.¹ (ECF No. 26.) Plaintiff was granted twenty-eight days from the date of that order to file an amended complaint and was specifically cautioned that the failure to respond to the court’s order in a timely manner could result in this action being dismissed. On March 30, 2018, plaintiff’s request for a twenty-eight day extension of time to file an amended complaint was granted. (ECF No. 28.) Again plaintiff was cautioned that the failure to timely comply with that order could result in the dismissal of this action. The twenty-eight day period has expired, and plaintiff has not responded to the court’s order in any manner.

////

¹ The parties have consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1). (ECF No. 12.)

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff show cause in writing within fourteen days of the date of this order as to why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.²

DATED: May 10, 2018

/s/ DEBORAH BARNES
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

² Plaintiff is cautioned that the failure to timely comply with this order will result in this case being dismissed.