

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

Juan Jimenez v. B. Cates, et al.

Jimenez v. Cates · No. 1:23-cv-01376-CDB · Decided December 16, 2025

OPINION

Cates

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 JUAN JIMENEZ, Case No.: 1:23-cv-01376-CDB 12 Plaintiff, ORDER DIRECTING
CLERK OF THE

COURT TO UPDATE PLAINTIFF’S

13 v. ADDRESS OF RECORD

14 B. CATES, et al., ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO

SHOW CAUSE IN WRITING WHY THIS

15 Defendants. ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED

FOR HIS FAILURE TO OBEY COURT

16 ORDERS AND FAILURE TO PROSECUTE

17 21-DAY DEADLINE

18 19 Plaintiff Juan Jimenez is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action 20
pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983.

21 I. INTRODUCTION

22 On October 6, 2025, this matter was reassigned from Magistrate Judge Gary S. Austin to 23 the
undersigned. (Doc. 9.) That same date, the reassignment order was served to Plaintiff at his 24
address on record with the Court. 25 On October 23, 2025, the United States Postal Service
returned the reassignment order 26 marked “Undeliverable,” “Refused,” and “Unable to
Forward.” That same date, the Clerk of the 27 Court updated Plaintiff’s address and re-served the
reassignment order, noting “per Returned Mail 1 On November 20, 2025, the Court issued its First
Screening Order. (Doc. 11.) 2 Specifically, the undersigned found Plaintiff’s complaint failed to
state a cognizable claim against 3 any named Defendant; Plaintiff was granted leave to file a first
amended complaint, curing the 4 deficiencies identified therein, or a notice of voluntary dismissal,
within 21 days. (Id. at 10-11.) 5 The screening order was served to Plaintiff at his new address on
record with the Court. More 6 than 30 days have now passed, and Plaintiff has failed to respond to
the Court’s First Screening 7 Order in any way.

8 II. DISCUSSION

9 The Local Rules,¹ corresponding with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, provide, ¹⁰ “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for ¹¹ the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” ¹² Local Rule 110. “District courts have inherent power to control their dockets” and, in exercising ¹³ that power, may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Auth.*, ¹⁴ *City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a ¹⁵ party’s failure to prosecute an action, obey a court order, or comply with local rules. See, e.g., ¹⁶ *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with a ¹⁷ court order to amend a complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir. ¹⁸ 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, ¹⁹ 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules). ²⁰ Here, Plaintiff has failed to obey the Court’s November 20, 2025, screening order ²¹ requiring him to file a first amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal. Nor has ²² Plaintiff sought an extension of time within which to do so. Moreover, the undersigned notes that ²³ a search of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)’s inmate locator ²⁴ tool reveals that Plaintiff is now incarcerated at the Substance Abuse Treatment Facility in ²⁵ ¹ In this Court’s September 20, 2023, order, Plaintiff was advised “the parties must comply with this ²⁶ Order, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (“Fed. R. Civ. P.”), and the Local Rules of the United States District Court, Eastern District of California (“Local Rules”) Failure to so comply with be grounds for ²⁷ imposition of sanctions which may include dismissal of the case.” (See Doc. 4 at 1 [First Informational Order in Prisoner/Civil Detainee Civil Rights Case].) The same order states “all Court deadlines are strictly enforced. Requests for extensions of time must be filed before the deadline expires and must state ¹ *Corcoran, California*. (See <https://ciris.mt.cdcr.ca.gov/results?cdcrNumber=AX0702>, as of ² 12/16/2025.) ³ Despite at least two transfers since filing suit, Plaintiff has failed to update his address ⁴ with the Court. It is his obligation to do so. See Local Rules 182(f) (“Each appearing attorney and ⁵ pro se party is under a continuing duty to notify the Clerk and all other parties of any change of ⁶ address Absent such notice, service of documents at the prior address ... shall be fully ⁷ effective”) & 183(b)² (“A party appearing in pro propria persona shall keep the Court and ⁸ opposing parties advised as to his or her current address. If mail directed to a plaintiff in pro ⁹ propria persona by the Clerk is returned by the U.S. Postal Service, and if such plaintiff fails to ¹⁰ notify the Court and opposing parties within thirty (30) days thereafter of a current address, the ¹¹ Court may dismiss the action without prejudice for failure to prosecute”); see also Doc. 4 at 1, ⁵ ¹² [First Informational Order].)³ ¹³ Although the Court elected to consult the CDCR’s inmate locator tool on this occasion ¹⁴ and will direct the Clerk of the Court to update Plaintiff’s address, the Court is not obligated to do ¹⁵ so. It is Plaintiff’s responsibility to keep the Court apprised of his current address throughout the ¹⁶ course of the litigation. Plaintiff is warned that in the event he fails to

keep the Court apprised of any change in address moving forward, the undersigned will recommend this action be dismissed for a failure to obey court orders and this Court's Local Rules, and for a failure to prosecute. Further, Plaintiff is encouraged to use the Notice of Change of Address form previously provided by the Court for this purpose.

III. CONCLUSION AND ORDERS

Accordingly, the Court ORDERS as follows: 1. The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to update Plaintiff's address to reflect he is now housed at the Substance Abuse Treatment Facility in Corcoran, California; and 2. Plaintiff SHALL show cause in writing, within 21 days of the date of service of this Amended January 1, 2025, to reflect a 30-day deadline. A Notice of Change of Address form was included for Plaintiff's use. (See Doc. 4 at 7.) I order, why this action should not be dismissed for his failure to comply with the Court's order of November 20, 2025. Alternatively, within that same time, Plaintiff may file a first amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal. Plaintiff may also file notice that he elects to stand on his complaint filed September 20, 2023, the practical effect of which will result in the undersigned recommending this action be dismissed for Plaintiff's failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Failure to comply with this Order to Show Cause (OSC) will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute. Further, should Plaintiff fail to comply with the Local Rules concerning his continuing obligation to keep the Court apprised of his current address, the undersigned will recommend this action be dismissed on that basis. SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 16, 2025 | wv Vv ED

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28