

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIASHARON E. TAYLOR,
Plaintiff,

v.

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
EMPLOYMENT AND HUMAN
SERVICES DEPARTMENT, et al.,
Defendants.Case No. [16-cv-03738-MEJ](#)**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE;
VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE**

Plaintiff Sharon Taylor (“Plaintiff”) filed a lawsuit alleging claims for harassment and discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Compl., Dkt. No. 1. Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint on September 30, 2016. Mot., Dkt. No. 14. When Plaintiff did not timely file an opposition to the Motion, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause why her case should not be dismissed. First Order to Show Cause, Dkt. No. 18. Plaintiff responded to the First Order to Show Cause (“OSC”), explaining why she had not responded to the Motion and requesting an extension of time to do so. Response, Dkt. No. 19. The Court discharged the OSC and ordered Plaintiff to respond to the Motion by December 1, 2016. Order, Dkt. No. 20. On November 28, 2016, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Non-Opposition and requested leave to amend her Complaint. Notice, Dkt. No. 21. The Court accordingly granted Defendants’ Motion, and gave Plaintiff leave to amend her Complaint. Order re Am. Compl., Dkt. No. 22. The Court specified that “Plaintiff shall file a first amended complaint (‘FAC’) no later than December 29, 2016.” *Id.* at 1. As of the date of this Order, Plaintiff has not filed a FAC.

Accordingly, the Court again **ORDERS** Plaintiff to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court deadlines. Plaintiff shall file a declaration by **January 19, 2017**. If a responsive declaration is filed, the Court shall issue an

1 order based on the declaration. Notice is hereby provided that failure to file a written response
2 will be deemed an admission that Plaintiff does not intend to prosecute, and the case will be
3 dismissed without prejudice. Thus, it is imperative that the Court receive a written response by
4 the deadline above.

5 In light of the status of this matter, the Court also **VACATES** the Case Management
6 Conference scheduled for January 19, 2017 and all associated deadlines.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8

9 Dated: January 6, 2017

10

11



MARIA-ELENA JAMES
United States Magistrate Judge

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28