

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 CALIFORNIAMITCHELL MARQUEZ, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
CITY OF SAN LEANDRO, et al.,
Defendants.Case No. [17-cv-01015-DMR](#)**ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITHOUT
PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO
PROSECUTE**

Re: Dkt. No. 45

Plaintiffs Mitchell Marquez and Christian Marquez filed this case through counsel on February 27, 2017. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss, which was granted with leave to amend. [Docket No. 33.] Plaintiffs' counsel subsequently filed a motion to withdraw, which the court granted on December 14, 2017. [Docket No. 36]. Since that time, Plaintiffs have pursued their lawsuit as self-represented parties.

Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on February 26, 2018. [Docket No. 41]. Defendants responded by filing a motion to dismiss on March 12, 2018. [Docket No. 44]. Plaintiffs should have filed any brief in opposition to Defendants' motion by March 27, 2018. *See* Civ. L.R. 7-3(a). No opposition was received. On March 30, 2018, the court issued an Order to Show Cause, instructing Plaintiffs to submit a written statement by no later than April 9, 2018 explaining their failure to file an opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint. [Docket No. 45.] The Order to Show Cause stated that failure to respond by April 9, 2018 may result in dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute. The Order to Show Cause was served via U.S. Mail to Plaintiffs' current address on file with the court, as well as to the e-mail address Plaintiff Mitchell Marquez provided to the court at the December 14, 2017 Case Management Conference.

Plaintiffs did not respond to the Order to Show Cause. Accordingly, this matter is

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

dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 23, 2018

