

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

Alice Billman et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

Billman v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. · No. 8:25-cv-01157-FWS-PVC · Decided August 12, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered Plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. The court noted that the deadline for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. to respond had passed after proof of service was filed and identified possible responses, including seeking default, stipulating to an extension, or voluntarily dismissing the action.

OPINION

Alice Billman v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL

Case No. 8:25-cv-01157-FWS-PVC Date August 12, 2025 Title Alice Billman et al v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. Present: The Honorable FRED W. SLAUGHTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Rolls Royce Paschal Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys Present for Defendants: None Present None Present Proceedings: (INCHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE DISMISSAL FOR LACK OF PROSECUTION

“[I]t is the plaintiff's responsibility to move a case toward a merits disposition.” Thomas v. Kernan, 2019 WL 8888200, at *1 (C.D. Cal. July 10, 2019) (citing Morris v. Morgan Stanley & Co., 942 F.2d 648, 652 (9th Cir. 1991)). That includes, where applicable, promptly (a) filing stipulations a defendant’s time to respond to the complaint, (6) pursuing default and remedies under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55 when a defendant fails to timely respond to the complaint, or (c) dismissing a case the plaintiff has chosen not to pursue for any reason. Here, Plaintiff has filed a proof of service, yet the deadline for Defendant to respond to the Complaint has passed and Plaintiff has taken no action. Accordingly, the court, on its own motion, hereby ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause in writing, no later than August 14, 2025, why this action not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. As an alternative to a written response by Plaintiff, Court will consider as an appropriate response to this OSC the filing of one of the following on or before the above date:

1. Plaintiff's Request for Entry of Default as to a// Defendants or Defendants’ Answer(s),

2. A stipulation extending Defendants' time to respond to the Complaint that complies with Local Rule 8.3, or

3. A notice of Voluntary Dismissal (Fed. R. Civ. P. 41) as to all Defendants.

No oral argument of this matter will be heard unless ordered by the Court. The Order will be submitted upon the filing of a timely and appropriate response. Failure to file a timely and appropriate response to this Order may result in dismissal without further notice or order from the court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); L. R. 41-6; *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629 (1962) ("The authority of a federal trial court to dismiss a plaintiff's action with prejudice because of his failure to prosecute cannot seriously be doubted."); *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL

Case No. 8:25-cv-01157-FWS-PVC Date August 12, 2025 Title Alice Billman et al v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005) ("[C]ourts may dismiss under Rule 41(b) sua sponte, at least under certain circumstances."); *Ash v. Cvetkov*, 739 F.2d 493, 496 (9th Cir. 1984) ("It is within the inherent power of court to sua sponte dismiss a case for lack of prosecution."). Initial of Deputy Clerk rrp