

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Atefa Samadi v. Amazon SMF3

No. 2:25-cv-3257-DC-JDP (PS), United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (January 12,
2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ordered plaintiff Atefa Samadi to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for failing to respond to Amazon SMF3’s motion to dismiss. The court continued the hearing, set deadlines for plaintiff’s opposition and response to the order, and warned that failure to respond would result in dismissal.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 ATEFA SAMADI, Case No. 2:25-cv-3257-DC-JDP (PS) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v.
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 14 AMAZON SMF3, 15 Defendant. 16 17 On December 2, 2025,
defendant filed a motion to dismiss this case for failure to state a 18 claim. ECF No. 25.

To date, plaintiff has not responded to defendant’s motion. 19 Under the court’s local rules, a
responding party is required to file an opposition or 20 statement of non-opposition to a motion no
later than fourteen days after the date it was filed. 21 E.D. Cal. L.R. 230(c).

To manage its docket effectively, the court requires litigants to meet 22 certain deadlines. The
court may impose sanctions, including dismissing a case, for failure to 23 comply with its orders
or local rules. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; Hells Canyon 24 Pres. Council v. U.S.
Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 25 1439, 1440-41 (9th
Cir.

1988). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a 26 duty to administer
justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. See 27 Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291
F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. 28 1 The court will give plaintiff the opportunity
to explain why sanctions should not be 2 | imposed for failure to file an opposition or statement of
non-opposition to defendant’s motion.

3 | Plaintiff’s failure to respond to this order will constitute a failure to comply with a court order
and 4 | will result in dismissal of this action. 5 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that: 6 1. The
January 22, 2026 hearing on defendant’s motion is continued to February 12, 7 | 2026, at 10:00

a.m. 8 2. By no later than January 26, 2026, plaintiff shall file an opposition or statement of non- 9
| opposition to defendant's motion.

10 3. Plaintiff shall show cause, by no later than January 26, 2026, why sanctions should not 11 |
be imposed for failure to timely file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to defendant's
12 | motion. 13 4. Defendant may file a reply to plaintiffs opposition, if any, no later than February
5, 14 | 2026. 15 16 IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: _ January 12, 2026 q——— 18 JEREMY D.
PETERSON 19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28