

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Thomas Maciejewski v. January Technologies, Inc.

Maciejewski · No. 2:25-cv-09263-SVW-MAA · Decided December 8, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California issued an order to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. The court directed the plaintiff to respond by December 17, 2025, noting that the defendant had not answered and that the plaintiff had not sought entry of default or dismissed the complaint.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stephen V. Wilson
DECIDED	December 8, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-09263-SVW-MAA
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 failed to answer and the plaintiff failed to seek entry of default.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- default
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the district court should require the plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution when the defendant had not answered and the plaintiff had not sought entry of default.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court may exercise its inherent power 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.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Court has inherent power to dismiss for lack of prosecution on its own motion” (Order to Show Cause)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

January Technologies, Inc. had not answered the complaint. Plaintiff Thomas Maciejewski had not requested entry of default. The court determined that the applicable time period had not been met and required plaintiff to explain why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the Central District of California. The defendant had not answered the complaint, and the plaintiff had not requested entry of default under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(a). The court sua sponte ordered the plaintiff to show cause in writing by December 17, 2025, why the case should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

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

OPINION

Thomas Maciejewski v. January Technologies, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.: 2:25-cv-09263-SVW-MAA Date: December 8, 2025 Title: Thomas Maciejewski v. January Technologies, Inc. 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 December 17, 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(s) January Technologies, Inc. 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.