For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEFF WEAVER,

v.

No. C 11-00150 SBA (PR)

5

1

2

3

4

6

7

8 9

10

11

13

14

12

15

16

17

18

19

21

20

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff,

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CONTINUED INTENT TO PROSECUTE THIS ACTION AND TO RESS: AND GRANTING HIM AN TENSION OF TIME TO FILE OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' DISPOSITIVE MOTION

Before the Court is Defendants' dispositive motion, which was filed on July 11, 2011. To date, Plaintiff's opposition has not been filed, and it is overdue.

On August 12, 2011, Northern District Judge Jeremy Fogel issued an Order permitting Plaintiff's former counsel, Richard Philip Sax, to withdraw appearance and granting a continuance to enable Plaintiff to retain new counsel.

On September 28, 2011, this action was reassigned to the undersigned judge. The record shows that Attorney Sax has "lost contact with Plaintiff." (Sax Decl. ¶ 4.) Furthermore, Plaintiff has not yet retained new counsel nor has he updated his current address with the Court.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), a district court may sua sponte dismiss an action for failure to prosecute or to comply with a court order. See Link v. Wabash R.R., 370 U.S. 626, 633 (1962); McKeever v. Block, 932 F.2d 795, 797 (9th Cir. 1991). But such a dismissal should only be ordered when the failure to comply is unreasonable. See id. A district court should afford the litigant prior notice of its intention to dismiss. See Malone v. United States Postal Serv., 833 F.2d 128, 133 (9th Cir. 1987). Pursuant to Northern District Local Rule 3-11, a party proceeding pro se whose address changes while an action is pending must promptly file and serve upon all opposing parties a notice of change of address specifying the new address. See L.R. 3-11(a). The Court may, without prejudice, dismiss a complaint or strike an answer when: (1) mail directed to the attorney or the <u>pro</u> se party by the court has been returned to the court as not

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

deliverable, and (2) the court fails to receive within sixty days of this return a written communication from the attorney or pro se party indicating a current address. See L.R. 3-11(b).

In the instant case, Plaintiff has lost contact with his former counsel, who has since withdrawn from this action. Plaintiff has never directly communicated with the Court; therefore, he does not have an address on record. Accordingly, it is in the interests of justice and judicial efficiency for the Court to establish Plaintiff's current address and whether he intends to continue to prosecute this action.

In light of the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file with the Court a notice of his current address and his continued intent to prosecute no later than thirty (30) days from the date of this Order. Failure to timely do so shall result in **dismissal of this action without prejudice** under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

IT IS ALSO HEREBY ORDERED that, if Plaintiff wishes to continue to prosecute this action, he is GRANTED an extension of time in which to file his opposition to Defendants' dispositive motion. The time in which Plaintiff may file his opposition to Defendants' dispositive motion will be extended up to and including thirty (30) days from the date he files the notice of his current address and his continued intent to prosecute. Defendants shall file a reply brief no later than **fifteen** (15) days after the date Plaintiff's opposition is filed.

The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff's former counsel, Richard Philip Sax, at the Law Offices of Richard Sax, 448 Sebastopol Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA 95401. The Clerk is also directed to contact Attorney Sax at (707) 525-1824, to obtain Plaintiff's last-known address, and to send a copy of this Order to that address.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 11/7/11

United States District Judge

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California