UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PAUL THOMAS, Plaintiff, v. WARE, et al., Defendants.	No. 2:22-cv-00177-TLN-EFB (PC) ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On March 30, 2023, the court ordered plaintiff to serve defendants with supplemental responses to RFP, Set One, on or before May 5, 2023. ECF No. 36 at 3. On April 24, 2023, plaintiff notified the court that he was unable to comply with the court's order because he did not have access to his C-file. ECF No. 37. He requested a court order directing the warden "to get the documents the defense has requested." ECF No. 37. On May 15, 2023, however, plaintiff served discovery responses on defendant. ECF No. 38. On this basis, the court finds that plaintiff's request for a court order is moot.

On June 5, 2023, defendants filed a motion to compel plaintiff to respond to their RFP Nos. 8 and 9, which seek information about plaintiff's related criminal matters. ECF No. 39. Plaintiff has not filed an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to defendant's motion and the time for doing so has passed.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

In cases in which one party is incarcerated and proceeding without counsel, motions ordinarily are submitted on the record without oral argument. Local Rule 230(*l*). "Opposition, if any, to the granting of the motion shall be served and filed by the responding party not more than twenty-one (21), days after the date of service of the motion." *Id*. A responding party's failure "to file an opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion and may result in the imposition of sanctions." *Id*.

Furthermore, a party's failure to comply with any order or with the Local Rules "may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court." Local Rule 110. The court may recommend that an action be dismissed with or without prejudice, as appropriate, if a party disobeys an order or the Local Rules. *See Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1263 (9th Cir. 1992) (district court did not abuse discretion in dismissing pro se plaintiff's complaint for failing to obey an order to re-file an amended complaint to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for pro se plaintiff's failure to comply with local rule regarding notice of change of address affirmed).

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff's April 24, 2023 motion (ECF No. 37) is denied as moot; and
2. Within 21 days of the date of this order, plaintiff shall file either an opposition to the motion to compel or a statement of no opposition. Failure to comply with this order may result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed without prejudice.

Dated: July 6, 2023.

EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE