

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

DANIEL JAMES ALTSTATT, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
CITY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:18-cv-00150-JAM-AC

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This matter is before the undersigned pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21). On July 3, 2018, the District Judge in this case adopted in full the undersigned’s recommendation that plaintiffs’ complaint be dismissed with partial leave to amend. ECF No. 85. That same day, the court entered a minute order informing plaintiffs that their amended complaint was due no later than August 2, 2018. ECF No. 86. Plaintiffs filed an interlocutory appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on July 25, 2018. ECF No. 88. Plaintiffs have not filed an amended complaint, and the deadline to do so has now passed. Plaintiffs are hereby cautioned that the filing of their interlocutory appeal with the Ninth Circuit does not stay this action.


Plaintiffs are hereby ordered to show cause why they have not filed an amended complaint by August 20, 2018. The filing of an amended complaint will discharge this order. If plaintiffs fail to file an amended complaint or show good cause by August 20, 2018, the undersigned will

///

1 recommend that the case be dismissed for failure to prosecute. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Local
2 Rule 110.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: August 6, 2018

5 
6 ALLISON CLAIRE
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28