

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

Marie Cassano v. Princess Cruise Lines Ltd. et al.

No. 2:25-cv-11759-SVW-MAR, United States District Court for the Central District of California (January 14,
2026)

OPINION

Marie Cassano v. Princess Cruise Lines Ltd. et al

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.: 2:25-cv-11759-SVW-MAR Date: January 14, 2026 Title: Marie Cassano v. Princess Cruise Lines Ltd. et al Present: The Honorable STEPHEN V. WILSON, United States District Judge Daniel Tamayo N/A Deputy Clerk Court Reporter Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s): Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s): None Appearing None Appearing Proceedings: [In Chambers] Order To Show Cause Re: Dismissal for Lack of Prosecution Plaintiff(s) are ORDERED to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. Link v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626 (1962) (Court has inherent power to dismiss for lack of prosecution on its own motion). The below time period(s) has not been met. Accordingly, the Court, on its own motion, orders Plaintiff(s) to show cause, in writing, on or before January 23, 2026, why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. This matter will stand submitted upon the filing of Plaintiff(s) response. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78. Failure to respond will be deemed consent to the dismissal of the action. ☒ Defendant(s) Princess Cruise Lines Ltd. did not answer the complaint, yet Plaintiff(s) have failed to request entry of default, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a). Plaintiff(s) can satisfy this order by seeking entry of default or by dismissing the complaint. IT IS SO ORDERED.