

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DEBRA PANIAGUA,
Plaintiff,
v.
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, et al.,
Defendants.

No. C 10-01981 CW
ORDER ON
PLAINTIFF'S
FAILURE TO FILE
AN OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO DISMISS

_____ /

On December 7, 2010, Defendants County of Alameda, et al., moved to dismiss Plaintiff Debra Paniagua's amended complaint. The hearing on Defendants' motion was set for January 20, 2011. Plaintiff, who is represented by an attorney, did not file a timely opposition.

Notably, Plaintiff also failed to respond timely to Defendants' first motion to dismiss. With respect to that motion, the Court issued an order directing her to file an opposition by a date certain. She did not file a substantive response, but instead offered a terse memorandum requesting leave to file an amended complaint.

Plaintiff shall file an opposition by January 13, 2011. If an opposition is filed, Defendants' reply shall be due one week thereafter. Defendants' motion will be taken under submission on

1 the papers. The Court VACATES the hearing set for January 20. The
2 initial case management conference, currently set for January 25,
3 is continued to February 15, 2011.

4 Because Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate diligence in
5 prosecuting her claims, any failure to comply with this Order will
6 result in the dismissal of her action for failure to prosecute.
7 Such dismissal will be with prejudice.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9
10 Dated: January 6, 2011



11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CLAUDIA WILKEN
United States District Judge