

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

PAUL T. BAILET-STONER,
Plaintiff,

v.

LISA SALCIDO, ELAINA CAMAS,
MARIA EGLACIAS, and PRODUCT
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,
Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-1108-JAM-EFB PS

ORDER

On May 31, 2018, the court granted plaintiff’s request to proceed *in forma pauperis*, directed the clerk to provide plaintiff with the forms required to effect service on defendant Product Development Corporation, and directed plaintiff to provide to the U.S. Marshal within fourteen days all information needed to effect service of process and to file a statement with the court within fourteen days thereafter that the documents were submitted.¹ ECF No. 3. Also on May 31, 2018, the court issued an order which, among other things, set a status (pretrial scheduling) conference for November 14, 2018, directed plaintiff to serve a copy of the order concurrently with service of process, and directed the parties to file status reports within fourteen days of the November 14, 2018 conference, or in this instance, by October 31, 2018. ECF No. 5.

¹ This case, in which plaintiff is proceeding in propria persona, is before the undersigned pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 302(c)(21). See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

1 The docket reveals that plaintiff has not filed a statement that the service documents were
2 submitted to the Marshal. Additionally, plaintiff did not file a status report, as required by the
3 May 31, 2018 order. Accordingly, the status conference is continued and plaintiff is ordered to
4 show cause why this case and/or any unserved defendants should not be dismissed as a result of
5 plaintiff's failure to follow court orders. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110 ("Failure
6 of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be
7 grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or
8 within the inherent power of the Court."); *see also* E.D. Cal. L.R. 183 ("Any individual
9 representing himself or herself without an attorney is bound by the Federal Rules of Civil or
10 Criminal Procedure and by these Local Rules."); *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir.
11 1995) ("Failure to follow a district court's local rules is a proper ground for dismissal.").

12 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

13 1. The status conference currently scheduled for November 14, 2018, is continued to
14 January 9, 2019 at 10:00 a.m., in Courtroom No. 8.

15 2. Plaintiff shall supply the United States Marshal, within 14 days from the date this order
16 is filed, all information needed by the Marshal to effect service of process, and shall, within 14
17 days thereafter, file a statement with the court that said documents have been submitted to the
18 United States Marshal.

19 3. Plaintiff shall show cause, in writing, on or before December 12, 2018, why sanctions
20 should not be imposed for failure to follow court orders and/or for failure to provide the Marshall
21 with the necessary documents to effect service of process.

22 4. By December 26, 2018, the parties shall file status reports (or a joint status report)
23 setting forth the matters referenced in the court's May 31, 2018 order, including the status of
24 service of process.

25 /////

26 /////

27 /////

28 /////

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

5. Failure of plaintiff to comply with this order may result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed for failure to follow court orders and/or for lack of prosecution under Rule 41(b).

DATED: November 6, 2018.


EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE