

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.

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	January 12, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-3257-DC-JDP (PS)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved to dismiss for failure to state a claim. After plaintiff failed to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition within the time required by the local rules, the court issued an order to show cause regarding sanctions and continued the motion hearing.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Atefa Samadi v. Amazon SMF3

TOPICS

- sanctions
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should require plaintiff to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for failing to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss.
2. Whether the hearing on defendant's motion to dismiss should be continued and plaintiff given additional deadlines to respond.

HOLDINGS

1. The court may impose sanctions, including dismissal, when a party fails to comply with court orders or applicable local rules; plaintiff was therefore required to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed and was warned that failure to respond to the order would result in dismissal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties.” (1)

“Plaintiff’s failure to respond to this order will constitute a failure to comply with a court order and will result in dismissal of this action.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendant filed a motion to dismiss the action for failure to state a claim. Plaintiff did not file an opposition or statement of non-opposition by the deadline established by the court's local rules. The court issued an order to show cause and gave plaintiff until January 26, 2026, to respond.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendant filed a motion to dismiss on December 2, 2025. Plaintiff did not respond within fourteen days as required by Eastern District of California Local Rule 230(c). The court ordered plaintiff to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition and to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed, warning that failure to respond to the order would result in dismissal.

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)