

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Hassaun Haygood v. Danny Chavez

Haygood · No. 1:24-cv-000239-SKO (PC) · Decided April 16, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ordered Plaintiff Hassaun Haygood to show cause why his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the Local Rules. The order arose from Plaintiff’s failure to timely oppose, or state non-opposition to, Defendant Danny Chavez’s motion to strike or dismiss the amended complaint.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sheila K. Oberto
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	April 16, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-000239-SKO (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued an order to show cause why Plaintiff's civil rights action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the Local Rules after Plaintiff failed to respond to Defendant's motion to strike or, alternatively, motion to dismiss.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court order; no precedential status is stated.

TOPICS

- sanctions
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure
- prisoners rights
- free exercise clause

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights
- constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Plaintiff's failure to respond to Defendant's motion as required by Local Rule 230(l) warranted an order to show cause and potential dismissal for failure to comply with the Local Rules.

HOLDINGS

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

KEY QUOTATIONS

“District courts have inherent power to control their dockets” (at 1)

“Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to show cause in writing, within 14 days of the date of service of this order, why this action should not be dismissed for his failure to comply with the Local Rules.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action proceeds under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on Plaintiff's First Amendment free exercise of religion claim against Defendant Chavez. After Defendant filed a motion to strike or alternatively dismiss the amended complaint, Plaintiff failed to file either an opposition or statement of non-opposition within the 21-day period required by Local Rule 230(l).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff, a former state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed a first amended complaint on March 6, 2025. Defendant filed a motion to strike or alternatively to dismiss on March 17, 2025. Plaintiff did not timely file an opposition or statement of non-opposition, so the court ordered him to show cause within 14 days or file the required response.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Thompson v. Housing Auth., City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)