

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Kurtis A. Meek v. BP Products North America, Inc., et al.

No. 2:25-cv-3318-DC-JDP (PS), United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (January 13,
2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California issued an order to show cause after the plaintiff failed to file a required status report. The court continued the initial scheduling conference, ordered the plaintiff to file a status report and explain why sanctions should not be imposed, and set the plaintiff's motion to remand for hearing.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 KURTIS A. MEEK, Case No. 2:25-cv-3318-DC-JDP (PS) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v.
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 14 BP PRODUCTS NORTH AMERICA, INC., et al., 15
Defendants. 16 17 18 The court previously issued an order setting an initial scheduling conference
for January 19 15, 2026, and directing the parties to file status reports by no later than January 5,
2026.

ECF 20 No. 6. Defendants timely submitted a status report. Plaintiff, however, failed to file his
own 21 status report. 22 To manage its docket effectively, the court imposes deadlines on litigants
and requires 23 litigants to meet those deadlines.

The court may impose sanctions, including dismissing a case, 24 for failure to comply with its
orders or local rules. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Hells Canyon Pres. 25 Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.,
403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 26 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988).
Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to 27 administer justice
expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties.

See Pagtalunan v. 28 Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. 1 The court will
give plaintiff the opportunity to explain why sanctions should not be 2 | imposed for failure to file
a status report. Plaintiff's failure to respond to this order will constitute 3 | another failure to
comply with a court order and will result in a recommendation that this action 4 | be dismissed.

Should plaintiff wish to continue with this lawsuit, he shall also file a status report 5 || as required
by the court's December 5, 2025 order. See ECF No. 6. 6 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED
that: 7 1. The initial scheduling conference currently set for January 15, 2026, is continued to 8 |

February 19, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. 9 2. By no later than January 29, 2026, plaintiff shall file a status report in accordance with 10 | the court's December 5, 2025 order.

See ECF No. 6. 11 3. Plaintiff shall show cause, by no later than January 29, 2026, why sanctions should not 12 | be imposed for failure to comply with the court's December 5, 2025 order. 13 4. On the court's own motion, plaintiff's motion to remand, ECF No. 8, is set for hearing 14 | on February 19, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. 15 5. Failure to comply with this order may result in the imposition of sanctions, including a 16 || recommendation that this action be dismissed for lack of prosecution and for failure to comply 17 | with court orders.

18 19 IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: _ January 13, 2026 q———— 21 JEREMY D. PETERSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 23 24 25 26 27 28