


1 numerous cases barring pro se litigants from representing other parties.

2 Though obvious, it bears repeating: Plaintiff Anthony Bailey may not represent the interests
3 of others appearing before this Court. As such, it is clear that neither Plaintiff Scott, Belcher, nor
4 Yates filed an opposition to Defendants' motion (#33).¹ Pursuant to Local Rule 7-2(d), "[t]he
5 failure of an opposing party to file points and authorities in response to any motion shall constitute
6 a consent to the granting of the motion." Accordingly, the Court will grant Defendants' motion as
7 follows: Plaintiffs Scott, Belcher, and Yates will be ordered to show cause, in writing, why they
8 should not have to either pay the filing fee or submit individual applications to proceed *in forma*
9 *pauperis*.

10 Based on the foregoing and good cause appearing therefore,

11 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants' Motion to Enforce Payment Fees on
12 Plaintiffs John Scott, Norman Belcher, and Gabriel Yates (#33) is **granted**. Plaintiffs Scott,
13 Belcher, and Yates are ordered to **SHOW CAUSE**, in writing, why they should not have to pay the
14 filing fee or submit individual applications to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The show cause briefing
15 is due not later than **Tuesday, January 21, 2014**. Defendants response, if any, shall be filed by
16 **Friday, January 24, 2014**. Unless further ordered, no replies will be considered. **FAILURE TO**
17 **COMPLY WITH THIS ORDER WILL RESULT IN A RECOMMENDATION THAT**
18 **PLAINTIFFS SCOTT, BELCHER, AND YATES BE DISMISSED FROM THIS LAWSUIT.**

19 DATED: January 8, 2014.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


C.W. Hoffman, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ Though Plaintiff Bailey filed a response (#34), he is not authorized to submit filings on behalf of the other named Plaintiffs.