

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

Chaderick A. Ingram v. The University of Phoenix, Inc.

Ingram · No. 2:25-cv-2652-DAD-JDP (PS) · Decided November 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ordered plaintiff Chaderick A. Ingram to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for failing to respond to the defendant'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 comply 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 CHADERICK A. INGRAM, Case No. 2:25-cv-2652-DAD-JDP (PS) 12
Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE 14 THE UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX, INC., 15
Defendant. 16 17 On September 22, 2025, defendant filed a motion to dismiss this case for failure
to state a 18 claim, which it set for hearing on November 13, 2025.¹ ECF Nos. 4 & 8.

To date, plaintiff has 19 not responded to defendant's motion. 20 Under the court's local rules, a
responding party is required to file an opposition or 21 statement of non-opposition to a motion no
later than fourteen days after the date it was filed. 22 E.D. Cal. L.R. 230(c).

To manage its docket effectively, the court requires litigants to meet 23 certain deadlines. The
court may impose sanctions, including dismissing a case, for failure to 24 comply with its orders
or local rules. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; Hells Canyon 25 Pres. Council v. U.S.
Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 26 1439, 1440-41 (9th
Cir.

1988). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a 27 1 Plaintiff has filed a
motion for summary judgment, which is also set for hearing on 28 November 13, 2025. ECF Nos.
9 & 11. 1 | duty to administer justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. See
2 | Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed.

R. Civ. P. 1. 3 The court will give plaintiff the opportunity to explain why sanctions should not be
4 | imposed for failure to file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to defendant's motion.
5 | Plaintiff's failure to respond to this order will constitute a failure to comply with a court order
and 6 | will result in dismissal of this action. 7 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that: 8 1.

The November 13, 2025 hearing on defendant's motion to dismiss and plaintiff's 9 | motion for summary judgment is continued to December 18, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. 10 2. By no later than November 26, 2025, plaintiff shall file an opposition or statement of 11 || non-opposition to defendant's motion. 12 3. Plaintiff shall show cause, by no later than November 26, 2025, why sanctions should 13 | not be imposed for failure to timely file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to 14 | defendant's motion.

15 4. Defendant may file a reply to plaintiff's opposition, if any, no later than December 11, 16 | 2025. 17 18 IT IS SO ORDERED. 19 (q — Dated: _ November 7, 2025 q—— 20 JEREMY D. PETERSON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 22 23 24 25 26 27 28