

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARK S. LAND,
Plaintiff,
v.
BANK OF AMERICA,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:16-cv-01494-LJO-BAM
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
REGARDING DISMISSAL OF THIS
ACTION FOR FAILURE TO STATE A
CLAIM AND FAILURE TO OBEY A COURT
ORDER
(Doc. 3)
FOURTEEN-DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff Frank Silva, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, initiated this civil action on October 5, 2016, alleging a violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1961 *et seq.*, by Defendant Bank of America. (Doc. 1).

On October 18, 2016, the Court issued an order dismissing Plaintiff’s complaint because it failed to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and failed to state a cognizable claim. Based on Plaintiff’s *pro se* status, the Court granted Plaintiff leave to amend. Plaintiff was directed to file a first amended complaint within thirty (30) days from service of the order. (Doc. 3). More than thirty days have passed and Plaintiff has failed to comply with this Court’s order.

DISCUSSION

Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure . . . of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . .

1 within the inherent power of the Court.” District courts have the inherent power to control their
2 dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where
3 appropriate, . . . dismissal.” *Thompson v. Housing Auth.*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A
4 court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action,
5 failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g., Ghazali v. Moran*, 46
6 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*,
7 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring
8 amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for
9 failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address);
10 *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply
11 with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack
12 of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules). In determining whether to dismiss an
13 action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules,
14 the court must consider several factors: (1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of
15 litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4)
16 the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less
17 drastic alternatives. *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at
18 130; *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24.

19 In the instant case, the Court finds that the public’s interest in expeditiously resolving this
20 litigation and the Court’s interest in managing the docket weigh in favor of dismissal because
21 there is no indication that Plaintiff intends to prosecute this action. Plaintiff failed to file an
22 amended complaint and did not otherwise contact the Court. The third factor, risk of prejudice to
23 defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from any
24 unreasonable delay in prosecuting an action. *Anderson v. Air West, Inc.*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th
25 Cir. 1976). The fourth factor, public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits, is
26 greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of dismissal. Finally, a court’s warning to a party that
27 his failure to obey the court’s order will result in dismissal satisfies the “consideration of
28 alternatives” requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779

1 F.2d at 1424. The Court’s order directing Plaintiff to file an amended complaint was clear that if
2 Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint in compliance with the Court’s order, then the action
3 would be dismissed with prejudice. (Doc. 3 at 5).

4 **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

5 Based on the above, **IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED** that this action be
6 **DISMISSED**, with prejudice, for Plaintiff’s failure to state a claim and failure to obey a court
7 order.

8 These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District
9 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within
10 **fourteen (14) days** after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may
11 file written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned “Objections to
12 Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file
13 objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of the “right to challenge the
14 magistrate’s factual findings” on appeal. *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014)
15 (citing *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

16
17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated: **December 2, 2016**

19 */s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe*
20 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE