

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Michael Painter v. Green Dot Bank

Painter v. Green Dot Bank · No. 2:25-cv-09442-AB (PDx) · Decided December 16, 2025

OPINION

Michael Painter v. Green Dot Bank

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.: 2:25-cv-09442-AB (PDx) Date: December 16, 2025 Title: Michael Painter v. Green Dot Bank Present: The Honorable ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR., United States District Judge Evelyn Chun 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 is 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 to show cause, in writing, on or before December 23, 2025, 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 Green Dot Bank did not answer the complaint, yet Plaintiff has failed to request entry of default, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a). Plaintiff can satisfy this order by seeking entry of default or by dismissing the complaint. IT IS SO ORDERED.