15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	
9	
10	DAN HARTMANN, No. C 09-03227 WHA
11	Plaintiff,
12	v. ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO
13	CHRISTIAN HANSON, et al., ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
14	Defendant.

The undersigned has received plaintiff's filings on January 4, 2010, regarding the pending orders to show cause. Plaintiff is reminded that two orders to show cause have been issued against him. The first was issued on December 10, 2009, following plaintiff's unexplained absence at a case management conference scheduled for that same day. In that order, plaintiff was ordered to show cause why he should not be subject to monetary sanctions for failing to appear at the CMC and why the case should not be dismissed for want of prosecution (Dkt. No. 27). The second order to show cause was issued on December 18, 2009, following plaintiff's failure to file any opposition to defendant's pending motion to dismiss (or alternatively, motion for summary judgment) (Dkt. No. 26). In the December 18 order, plaintiff was ordered to show cause why defendant's motion should *not* be treated as unopposed and ruled on accordingly. In light of plaintiff's January 4 response, plaintiff will be given the opportunity to address both of these orders to show cause at the hearing on THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 2010, AT 2 P.M.

The undersigned will delay ruling on defendant's dispositive motion until plaintiff has had the opportunity to be heard.

Plaintiff shall not file any amended complaint until — if ever and if allowed — after a ruling on the pending motion, as to which plaintiff's counsel completely failed without cause to respond. At the hearing on Thursday, all counsel shall be allowed to address whether the pending motion filed by defendant Hanson should be granted without leave to amend.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 5, 2010.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE