

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.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeremy D. Peterson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 13, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-3318-DC-JDP (PS)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause after plaintiff failed to file a required status report and continued the initial scheduling conference.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; limited precedential value.

TOPICS

sanctions civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure docket management sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether plaintiff should be required to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for failing to comply with the court’s order requiring a status report.

2. Whether the initial scheduling conference should be continued and new deadlines imposed.
3. Whether plaintiff's motion to remand should be set for hearing.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may impose sanctions, including dismissal, for failure to comply with court orders or local rules; because plaintiff failed to file the required status report, the court ordered him to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed.
2. Before imposing sanctions, the court must provide plaintiff an opportunity to explain his failure to file the status report; failure to respond to the order may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties.” (at 1)

“Plaintiff’s failure to respond to this order will constitute another failure to comply with a court order and will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had directed the parties to submit status reports before the initial scheduling conference. Defendants complied, but plaintiff failed to submit his report by the court-ordered deadline.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court had previously ordered the parties to file status reports by January 5, 2026, and set an initial scheduling conference for January 15, 2026. Defendants filed a timely status report, but plaintiff did not. The court ordered plaintiff to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed, required plaintiff to file the status report, continued the scheduling conference, and set plaintiff's motion to remand for hearing.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005)
- Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002)