

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Vampire Family Brands, LLC v. Williams-Sonoma, Inc.

Vampire Family Brands · No. 2:25-cv-08158-SVW-AS · Decided October 8, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Vampire Family Brands, LLC to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. The court noted that Williams-Sonoma, Inc. had not answered the complaint and directed the plaintiff to seek entry of default or dismiss the complaint by October 20, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stephen V. Wilson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	October 8, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-08158-SVW-AS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution after the defendant had not answered and the plaintiff had not requested entry of default.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Vampire Family Brands, LLC v. Williams-Sonoma, Inc.

TOPICS

- default
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court could sua sponte require the plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

2. Whether the plaintiff's failure to seek entry of default after the defendant failed to answer warranted an order to show cause.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal district court has inherent authority to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution on its own motion and may require the plaintiff to show cause why dismissal should not occur.
2. Where the defendant had not answered and the plaintiff had failed to request entry of default under Rule 55(a), the court could require the plaintiff to show cause and direct the plaintiff either to seek entry of default or dismiss the complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Court has inherent power to dismiss for lack of prosecution on its own motion”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Williams-Sonoma, Inc. had not answered the complaint. The plaintiff had not requested entry of default under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(a), and the court therefore questioned whether the action was being prosecuted.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was pending in the Central District of California. On its own motion, the court ordered the plaintiff to respond by October 20, 2025, explaining why the case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution; the plaintiff could satisfy the order by seeking entry of default or dismissing the complaint.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Link v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626 (1962)