

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Luis Garcia v. California Department of Developmental Services

Garcia · No. 1:24-cv-00665-SAB · Decided December 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California discharged an order to show cause after the plaintiff filed a signed stipulation of dismissal. The court held that the action was terminated pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(ii), directed the clerk to close the case, and ordered the docket adjusted to reflect the stipulated dismissal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stanley A. Boone
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 5, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00665-SAB
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court addressed an order to show cause concerning the parties' failure to file dispositional documents and acted on the plaintiff's subsequently filed stipulation of dismissal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- sanctions
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the order to show cause should be discharged without imposing sanctions.
- Whether the parties' stipulation required termination of the action and closure of the case under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(ii).

HOLDINGS

- 1. The order to show cause should be discharged without imposing sanctions.
- 2. The action was terminated and dismissed pursuant to the terms of the parties' stipulation under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(ii), requiring the clerk to close the case and adjust the docket accordingly.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties failed to file dispositional documents by a court-ordered deadline, prompting the court to issue an order to show cause regarding possible sanctions. The plaintiff later filed a signed stipulation of dismissal, although he did not respond to the order to show cause. The court declined to impose sanctions and treated the stipulation as terminating the action.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On November 25, 2025, the court issued an order to show cause requiring the parties to explain why sanctions should not be imposed for failure to file dispositional documents by the deadline. On December 3, 2025, the plaintiff filed a signed stipulation of dismissal but did not respond to the order to show cause. The court discharged the order to show cause without sanctions, recognized the stipulated dismissal, terminated the action, and directed the clerk to close the case and adjust the docket.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Wilson v. City of San Jose, 111 F.3d 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1997)

OPINION

Garcia

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

10

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 12 LUIS GARCIA, Case No. 1:24-cv-00665-SAB 13 Plaintiff, ORDER DISCHARGING
ORDER TO

SHOW CAUSE AND DIRECTING CLERK

14 v. OF COURT TO CLOSE CASE AND

ADJUST DOCKET TO REFLECT

15 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF STIPULATED DISMISSAL

DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES,

16 (ECF No. 32) Defendant. 17 18 On November 25, 2025, the Court issued an order to show
cause, requiring the parties to 19 show cause in writing why sanctions should not be imposed for
failure to file dispositional 20 documents by the court ordered deadline. (ECF Nos. 30, 31.) On
December 3, 2025, Plaintiff 21 timely filed a signed stipulation of dismissal. (ECF No. 32.)
However, Plaintiff did not respond 22 to the order to show cause. Counsel is advised that upon
receiving an order to show cause, a 23 response addressing why the conduct should be excused is
required. In this instance, the Court 24 will discharge the order to show cause without the
imposition of sanctions. 25 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that: 26 1. The November
25, 2025 order to show cause is DISCHARGED (ECF No. 31); and 27 2. In light of the stipulation
(ECF No. 32), this action has been terminated, Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(ii); Wilson v. City of
San Jose, 111 F.3d 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1997), and 1 has been dismissed pursuant to the terms of the
stipulation. Accordingly, the Clerk of 2 the Court is hereby DIRECTED to close the file in this
case and adjust the docket to 3 reflect stipulated dismissal of this action pursuant to Rule 41(a). 4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED. FA. Se

6 | Dated: _ December 4, 2025 "

STANLEY A. BOONE

7 United States Magistrate Judge 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28