

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Huntington v. Sacramento County

No. 2:24-cv-0690-JDP (P), United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (February 28, 2025)

SUMMARY

The court orders plaintiff Michael Huntington to show cause why his action against Sacramento County should not be dismissed. The order states that plaintiff failed to respond after being given thirty days to file an amended complaint or notice of voluntary dismissal, and warns that failure to respond within twenty-one days will result in a recommendation of dismissal for failure to prosecute, failure to comply with court orders, and failure to state a claim.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeremy D. Peterson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	February 28, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-0690-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After screening plaintiff's complaint and finding that it failed to state a claim, the court ordered plaintiff to file an amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal. When plaintiff failed to respond, the court issued an order to show cause why the action should not be dismissed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- sanctions
- default
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court may dismiss an action for failure to prosecute, failure to comply with a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.
2. Whether plaintiff should be required to show cause why the action should not be dismissed after failing to file an amended complaint or notice of voluntary dismissal.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal district court has inherent authority to control its docket and may impose sanctions, including dismissal, when a party fails to prosecute an action, obey a court order, or comply with applicable local rules.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Michael Huntington filed a civil-rights action against Sacramento County. After screening, the court determined that the complaint did not state a claim and directed plaintiff to file an amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal within thirty days. Plaintiff did not file either document or otherwise respond.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 14, 2025, the court screened the complaint and notified plaintiff that it failed to state a claim. The court gave plaintiff thirty days to file an amended complaint or notice of voluntary dismissal. Plaintiff filed no response, prompting this order to show cause and a twenty-one-day deadline to explain why the action should not be dismissed or to file an amended complaint.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Bautista v. Los Angeles County*, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000)
- *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)