

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

DARRELL ALLO, JR., ET AL.

CIVIL ACTION

VERSUS

NO. 09-6524

STATE FARM FIRE & CASUALTY COMPANY

SECTION "B"(4)

ORDER AND REASONS

After failing to respond to the rule to show cause of this court, **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiffs, Darrell Allo, Jr. and Starlet P. Allo's claims are hereby **DISMISSED** from this action without prejudice.

Plaintiffs failed to comply with the court order requiring them to submit to the court a status report (Record Document No. 6).

Per Order dated April 12, 2010 Plaintiffs, Darrell Allo, Jr. and Starlet P. Allo were ordered to show cause in writing no later than April 29, 2010 why this matter should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute or timely comply with court orders (Record Document Nos. 6 and 11).

Plaintiffs were warned that failure to timely comply with orders of the Court may result in dismissal of their case for failure to prosecute without further notice. A review of the record in this matter indicates that the order was send to Plaintiffs and has not been returned as undeliverable.

While we construe *pro se* pleadings liberally, *pro se* litigants, like all other parties, must abide by procedural rules. e.g., *United States v. Wilkes*, 20 F. 3d 651, 653 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994).

*Pro se* litigants under law are responsible for their actions and inactions to the same extent as represented parties. *Birl v. Estelle*, 660 F.2d 592, 593 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981).

Accordingly, due to Plaintiffs Darrell Allo, Jr. and Starlet P. Allo's failing to respond to court's directive, **IT IS ORDERED** that their claims are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41 for failure to prosecute their claims.

New Orleans, Louisiana, this 25<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2010.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE