

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Layla Suggett v. Solano County, et al.

Suggett · No. 2:23-cv-0907-TLN-JDP (P) · Decided December 9, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ordered plaintiff Layla Suggett to show cause why her action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with local rules. The order gives plaintiff twenty-one days to explain the failure to respond to defendants’ motion to dismiss and to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition.

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	December 9, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-0907-TLN-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Order to show cause issued after defendants filed a motion to dismiss and plaintiff failed to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; no precedential status stated.
PARTIES	Layla Suggett v. Solano County, et al.

TOPICS

- sanctions
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure
- section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether plaintiff should be required to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with local rules after failing to respond to defendants' motion to dismiss.

2. Whether the court may impose dismissal as a sanction for failure to comply with court orders or local rules.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may impose sanctions, including dismissal, for failure to comply with its orders or local rules, although involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendants filed a motion to dismiss on October 28, 2025. Plaintiff did not file a response or statement of non-opposition by the date of the order. The court issued an order to show cause and warned that failure to respond would result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendants filed a motion to dismiss on October 28, 2025. Plaintiff had not filed a response by the date of the order. The court ordered plaintiff to show cause within twenty-one days why the action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with local rules, and directed her to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition if she wished to continue the lawsuit.

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)