

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Bruce Dwain Copeland v. Daniel Torrez et al.

Copeland v. Torrez · No. 2:25-cv-08068-SPG · Decided November 14, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Plaintiff Bruce Copeland to show cause in writing why his case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. The order notes that Plaintiff had not filed anything in the case, including a proof of service, since filing the complaint, and sets November 21, 2025, as the response deadline.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sherilyn Peace Garnett
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	November 14, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-08068-SPG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution after the plaintiff failed to file anything in the case, including a proof of service.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished_or_nonprecedential

TOPICS

- service of process
- sanctions
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should require plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution based on plaintiff's failure to prosecute the action and file proof of service.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal district court has inherent authority to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution on its own motion, including dismissal with prejudice when warranted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The authority of a federal trial court to dismiss a plaintiff’s action with prejudice because of his failure to prosecute cannot seriously be doubted.” (at 629)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Bruce Copeland filed the action on August 25, 2025, against Daniel Torrez and the United States District Court for the Central District of California. After filing the complaint, plaintiff filed nothing further, including the proof of service required by Central District of California Local Rule 4-6.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the civil-rights action on August 25, 2025, against Daniel Torrez and the United States District Court for the Central District of California. The court observed that plaintiff had not filed a proof of service or any other document after filing the action and ordered plaintiff to show cause in writing by November 21, 2025, why the case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Link v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629 (1962)

OPINION

Bruce Dwain Copeland v. Daniel Torrez et al.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL

Case No. 2:25-cv-08068-SPG Date November 14, 2025 Title Bruce Dwain Copeland v. Daniel Torrez et al. ee Present: The Honorable SHERILYN PEACE GARNETT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

P. Gomez Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter / Recorder Attorneys Present for Plaintiff: Attorneys Present for Defendants: Not Present Not Present Proceeding: (INCHAMBERS)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE LACK OF

PROSECUTION

On August 25, 2025, Plaintiff Bruce Copeland (“Plaintiff”) filed this case against Defendants Daniel Torrez and the United States District Court, Central District of California (together,

“Defendants”). (ECF No. 1). The Court takes notice that Plaintiff has not filed anything in the case since, including a proof of service. See C.D. Cal. L.R. 4-6 (“The plaintiff must file a proof of service within 14 days of service of the summons and complaint or receipt of a notice and acknowledgement of service. Failure to file a proof of service timely may result in the imposition of sanctions against the plaintiff, including but not limited to the dismissal of the defendant that was the subject of the proof of service.”). The Court enjoys the inherent power to dismiss for lack of prosecution on its own motion. See, e.g., *Link v. Wabash R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629 (1962) (“The authority of a federal trial court to dismiss a plaintiff’s action with prejudice because of his failure to prosecute cannot seriously be doubted.”). Consistent with that authority, the Court ORDERS Plaintiffs to show cause, in writing, on or before November 21, 2025, why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. This matter will stand submitted upon the filing of Plaintiffs’ response. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78. Failure to respond will be deemed consent to the dismissal of the action. IT IS SO ORDERED. Initials of Preparer pg