

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Lucio Justo Ramos Carrillo v. Dutch Germany Int. Embassy, et al.

Carrillo · No. 2:25-cv-2349-JDP (P) · Decided November 19, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ordered plaintiff Lucio Justo Ramos Carrillo to show cause why his case should not be dismissed. The order states that plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee or submit a complete application to proceed in forma pauperis, and directs him to comply within twenty-one days. It warns that failure to respond may result in a recommendation of dismissal for failure to pay, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with court orders.

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	November 19, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-2349-JDP (P)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued an order to show cause after plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee or submit a complete application to proceed in forma pauperis within the time required by a prior order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; nonprecedential

TOPICS

- sanctions
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should require plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for failure to pay the filing fee, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with court orders.
2. Whether failure to respond to the order to show cause should result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may impose sanctions, including dismissal, when a litigant fails to comply with court orders or applicable local rules.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The court may impose sanctions, including dismissal of a case, for failure to comply with court orders or local rules.” (at 1)

“Plaintiffs 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 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had previously directed plaintiff to submit either the required filing fee or a complete application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Plaintiff failed to comply with that order by the time of the order to show cause. The court gave plaintiff an additional twenty-one days to explain the noncompliance and to pay the fee or submit a complete application.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff commenced this civil-rights action. On October 8, 2025, the court ordered plaintiff to pay the required filing fee or submit a complete application to proceed in forma pauperis within thirty days. Plaintiff did not comply, so the court ordered him to show cause within twenty-one days why the action should not be dismissed for failure to pay the filing fee, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with court orders.

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)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 LUCIO JUSTO RAMOS CARRILLO, Case No. 2:25-cv-2349-JDP (P) 12
Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 14 DUTCH GERMANY INT. EMBASSY, et al., 15

Defendants. 16 17 18 19 On October 8, 2025, I ordered plaintiff to submit within thirty days either the required 20 filing fee or a complete application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

ECF No. 6. To date, 21 plaintiff has not complied with that order. 22 To manage its docket effectively, the court requires litigants to meet certain deadlines. 23 The court may impose sanctions, including dismissal of a case, for failure to comply with court 24 orders or local rules. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; Hells Canyon Pres. Council 25 v. U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir.

2005); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 26 (9th Cir. 1988). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to 27 28 1 | administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. See Pagtalunan v. 2 | Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. 3 Plaintiff will be given a chance to explain why the court should not dismiss his case based 4 | on his failure to either pay the filing fee or submit a complete application for leave to proceed in 5 | forma pauperis.

Plaintiffs failure to respond to this order will constitute another failure to 6 | comply with a court order and will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. 7 | Accordingly, plaintiff is ordered to show cause within twenty-one days why this case should not 8 | be dismissed for failure to pay the filing fee, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with court 9 | orders.

Should plaintiff wish to continue with this action, he must, within twenty-one days, either 10 | pay the required filing fee or submit a complete application for leave to proceed in forma 11 || pauperis. The Clerk of Court is directed to send to plaintiff the court's form application for leave 12 | to proceed in forma pauperis. 13 4 IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: _ November 19, 2025 Q_—_—.

16 JEREMY D. PETERSON 7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28