1	E-filed 10/13/2016	
2		
3		
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
5	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
6		
7	SCOTT JOHNSON,	Case No.16-cv-01491-HRL
8	Plaintiff,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
9	v.	ANSWER SHOULD NOT BE STRICKEN
10	MILTON P. TAORMINO, et al.,	
11	Defendants.	
12	On September 19, 2016, the Court issued an order instructing the parties to complete a	
13	joint inspection by October 7, 2016. The order stated: "[i]f the parties fail to comply with this	
14	order, the court may issue an order to show cause why the defendants' answer should not be	
15	stricken." Dkt. No. 23.	
16	The plaintiff has informed the court that he has attempted to schedule a joint site inspection	
17	but has received no response from the defendants. As a result, the court hereby orders the	
18	defendants to show cause, if any, why their answer should not be stricken for failure to comply	
19	with General Order 56. The parties shall appear at a show cause hearing on November 22, 2016,	
20	at 10:00 AM, in Courtroom 2, Fifth Floor, 280 South First Street, San Jose, California. The	
21	defendants shall file a statement in response to this order to show cause no later than November	
22	15, 2016.	
23	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
24	Dated: 10/13/2016	$\cdot \cap$
25	$\Lambda \setminus I$	
26	1 htm	
27	HOWARD R. LLOYD United States Magistrate Judge	
28		