

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

Sam Benford v. Emil Douglas Tejada et al.

No. CV 22-09286-SPG(MARx), United States District Court for the Central District of California (March 15,
2023)

OPINION

Sam Benford v. Emil Douglas Tejada

PER CURIAM.

Case 2:22-cv-09286-SPG-JPR Document15 Filed 03/15/23 Page11of1 Page ID #:67

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL

Case No. CV 22-09286-SPG(MARx) Date March 15, 2023 Title Sam Benford v. Emil Douglas
Tejada et al Present: The Honorable SHERILYN PEACE GARNETT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

P. Gomez Not Reported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter / Recorder Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:
Attorneys Present for Defendants: Not Present Not Present Proceeding: 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 March 30,
2023, 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 Emil Douglas Tejada 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. Initials of Preparer pg Page 1 of 1