

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Knutson v. Equifax, Inc., et al.

Knutson · No. 1:25-cv-00255-JLT-SAB · Decided August 12, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ordered the parties to show cause why sanctions should not issue for failing to file stipulated dispositional documents by the court-ordered deadline. The order warns that failure to comply may result in sanctions, including possible dismissal, and sets August 15, 2025, as the response deadline.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stanley A. Boone
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 12, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00255-JLT-SAB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued an order to show cause after the parties failed to file court-ordered dispositional documents by the deadline established following notice of settlement.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

[sanctions](#) [civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[Civil procedure](#) [Federal courts](#) [Sanctions](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties should be required to show cause why sanctions should not issue for failing to file court-ordered dispositional documents by the deadline.

2. Whether the court possesses authority under its inherent power and Local Rule 110 to impose sanctions, potentially including dismissal, for failure to comply with a court order.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal district court has inherent power to control its docket and may impose appropriate sanctions, including dismissal, when a party or counsel fails to comply with court rules or orders.
2. The parties must show cause in writing by August 15, 2025, why sanctions should not issue for failing to file the required stipulated dispositional documents, and failure to comply with the show-cause order will result in sanctions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action.” (at 1)

“Failure to comply with this order will result in the issuance of sanctions.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff brought the action against multiple defendants, including Equifax, Inc., which later became the only remaining defendant. After the parties notified the court that they had reached a settlement, the court ordered them to file dispositional documents within sixty days. The deadline passed without the required documents or a request for additional time, prompting the order to show cause.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff commenced the action on February 27, 2025, and Equifax filed an answer on April 14, 2025. Plaintiff notified the court on June 9, 2025, that she had settled with Equifax, the only remaining defendant, and that dispositional documents would be filed within sixty days. The court ordered the parties to file those documents by June 10, 2025, but the deadline expired without filing or a request for extension. The court therefore required the parties to show cause in writing why sanctions should not issue.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Bautista v. Los Angeles County*, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000)

OPINION

Knutson v. TransUnion, LLC

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 TAMMY KNUTSON, Case No. 1:25-cv-00255-JLT-SAB 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
REQUIRING THE PARTIES TO

SHOW CAUSE IN WRITING WHY

13 v. SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT ISSUE FOR

FAILURE TO FILE DISPOSITIONAL

14 DOCUMENTS BY COURT ORDERED

EQUIFAX, INC., et al., DEADLINE 15 Defendants. (ECF No. 31) 16

DEADLINE: AUGUST 15, 2025

17 18 On February 27, 2025, Plaintiff initiated this action against multiple defendants, 19
including Equifax, Inc. (ECF No. 1.) On April 14, 2025, Defendant Equifax filed its answer. 20
(ECF No. 21.) 21 On June 9, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice that a settlement has been reached with
Equifax, 22 the only remaining defendant in this action, and that dispositional documents would
be filed 23 within sixty days. (ECF No. 30.) On June 10, 2025, the Court issued an order setting
the 24 deadline to file dispositional documents no later than sixty days. (ECF No. 31.) The
deadline 25 has expired, and the parties have failed to file such documents or otherwise request an
extension 26 of time to do so. 27 Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to
comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the
Court of any and all 1 | sanctions ... within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the
inherent power to 2 | control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions
where appropriate, 3 | including dismissal of the action. *Bautista v. Los Angeles Cnty.*, 216 F.3d
837, 841 (9th Cir. 4 | 2000). For the second time in this action (see ECF No. 26), the Court shall
require the parties to 5 | show cause why sanctions should not issue for the failure to file
dispositional documents in 6 | compliance with a court order. 7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY
ORDERED that: 8 1. The parties shall show cause in writing no later than August 15, 2025, why 9
sanctions should not issue for the failure to file stipulated dispositional documents 10 by the
deadline required by the June 10, 2025, order (ECF No. 31). The parties 11 are advised that filing
dispositional documents without also filing documents 12 showing cause in writing why sanctions
should not issue does not constitute 13 compliance with this order; and 14 2. Failure to comply
with this order will result in the issuance of sanctions. 15

16 IT IS SO ORDERED. FA. ee

17 | Dated: _ August 12, 2025

STANLEY A. BOONE

18 United States Magistrate Judge 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28