

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

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