

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Rasheed v. United States Government Agent, et al.

Rasheed · No. 25-cv-04096-TSH · Decided June 20, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California orders Tahee A. Rasheed to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court deadlines. The court requires a declaration by July 3, 2025 and warns that failure to respond will likely result in dismissal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Thomas S. Hixson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	June 20, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-04096-TSH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After granting Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis, the court found the complaint deficient under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), ordered Plaintiff to file a first amended complaint, and, after Plaintiff failed to respond, issued an order to show cause why the action should not be dismissed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Tahee A. Rasheed v. United States Government Agent, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Federal civil litigation
- Freedom of Information Act

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should require Plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court deadlines.

HOLDINGS

1. A court possesses inherent authority to dismiss an action sua sponte to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court possesses the inherent power to dismiss an action sua sponte “to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.”” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Tahee A. Rasheed initiated the action by filing a complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted in forma pauperis status but determined that the complaint was deficient under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) and gave Plaintiff a deadline to file a curative amended complaint. Plaintiff failed to respond by the deadline.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the application on May 19, 2025, but found the complaint deficient and directed Plaintiff to file a first amended complaint by June 12, 2025. Plaintiff did not respond, so the court ordered Plaintiff to show cause by July 3, 2025, why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court deadlines.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-33 (1962)

OPINION

Rasheed v. United States Government Agent

PER CURIAM.

1

2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4 5 TAHEE A. RASHEED, Case No. 25-cv-04096-TSH 6 Plaintiff,

7 y. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

8 UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

9 AGENT, et al., Defendants. 10 11 Plaintiff Tahee A. Rasheed initiated this lawsuit by filing a complaint (ECF No. 1) and 12 || application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2). On May

19, 2025, the Court granted the 5 13 application but found the complaint deficient under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). ECF No. 4. As such, the 14 || Court directed Plaintiff to file a first amended complaint curing the deficiencies identified in the 3 15 screening order by June 12, 2025. The Court warned that if Plaintiff failed to cure the a 16 || deficiencies, the case would likely be reassigned to a district judge with a recommendation for 3 17 || dismissal. Plaintiff has failed to respond. 18 The Court possesses the inherent power to dismiss an action sua sponte “to achieve the 19 || orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.” *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629-33 20 || (1962). Accordingly, the Court ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause why this case should not be 2] dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court deadlines. Plaintiff shall file a 22 || declaration by July 3, 2025. Notice is hereby provided that failure to file a written response will 73 || be deemed an admission that you do not intend to prosecute, and this case will likely be dismissed. Thus, it is imperative the Court receive a written response by the deadline above. 5 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 Dated: June 20, 2025

27 TAA} ☐☐

THOMAS S. HIXSON

28 United States Magistrate Judge