

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

TILLMAN NORTH,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
vs.	:	CIVIL ACTION 07-0355-CG-C
RAY ROLINS,	:	
Defendant.	:	

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff, an Escambia County Jail inmate proceeding *pro se*, filed a complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 together with a motion to proceed without prepayment of fees. This action was referred to the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 72.2(c)(4), and is now before Court for plaintiff's failure to prosecute and to comply with the Court's order.

The Court's order, entered October 12, 2007, required plaintiff by November 9, 2007 to provide the Court with the date of the incident in the complaint and facts describing the incident.<sup>1</sup> (Doc. 8). Plaintiff was warned that the fail to comply with the

---

<sup>1</sup>Plaintiff filed eight actions with this Court. Most of these actions seem connected to the incident in which plaintiff complains of excessive force being used against him, *North v. Walden*, CA 07-0162-WS-C (S.D. Ala. Oct. 24, 2007). Plaintiff alleged his was beaten by defendant Walden after he was stopped by the defendant, then he was beaten as he was taken to the hospital, and then he was beaten at the jail by officials. Plaintiff's action was dismissed as

order within the prescribed time would result in the dismissal of his action. Plaintiff's copy of the Court's order has not been returned to the Court, and plaintiff has not responded to the Court's order.

Due to plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's order and to prosecute this action, and upon consideration of the alternatives that are available to the court, it is recommended that this action be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as no other lesser sanction will suffice. *Link v. Wabash R. R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630, 82 S.Ct. 1386 (1962) (interpreting Rule 41(b) not to restrict the court's inherent authority to dismiss *sua sponte* an action for lack of prosecution); *World Thrust Films, Inc. v. International Family Entertainment, Inc.*, 41 F.3d 1454, 1456-57 (11th Cir. 1995); *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-op*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989); *Goforth v. Owens*, 766 F.2d 1533, 1535 (11th Cir. 1985); *Jones v. Graham*, 709 F.2d 1457, 1458 (11th Cir. 1983); *Hildebrand v. Honeywell*, 622 F.2d 179, 181 (5th Cir. 1980).<sup>2</sup> *Accord Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 111 S.Ct. 2123 (1991) (ruling that federal courts' inherent power to manage their own proceedings authorized the imposition of attorney's fees and related expenses as a sanction); *Malautea*

---

frivolous because it was barred by the statute of limitations.

In the present action, plaintiff complains of excessive force while he was in handcuffs, states that he was taken to the hospital, and that the defendant is an officer at the Atmore City Jail. These allegations are similar to those in CA 07-0162-WS-C.

<sup>2</sup>The Eleventh Circuit in *Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206, 1209 (11th Cir. 1981) (*en banc*), adopted as binding precedent the decisions of the former Fifth Circuit rendered prior to October 1, 1981.

*v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 987 F.2d 1536, 1545-46 (11th Cir.) (finding that the court's inherent power to manage actions before it permitted the imposition of fines), *cert. denied*, 510 U.S. 863 (1993).

The instructions that follow the undersigned's signature contain important information regarding objections to the report and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge.

**DONE** this the 15th day of September, 2008.

s/WILLIAM E. CASSADY  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURAL RIGHTS AND  
RESPONSIBILITIES FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION, AND  
FINDINGS CONCERNING NEED FOR TRANSCRIPT**

1. **Objection.** Any party who objects to this recommendation, or anything in it, must, within ten days of the date of service of this document, file specific written objections with the Clerk of this Court. Failure to do so will bar a *de novo* determination by the district judge of anything in the recommendation and will bar an attack, on appeal, of the factual findings of the Magistrate Judge. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *Lewis v. Smith*, 855 F.2d 736, 738 (11th Cir. 1988); *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. Unit B, 1982)(*en banc*). The procedure for challenging the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge is set out in more detail in SD ALA LR 72.4 (June 1, 1997), which provides that:

A party may object to a recommendation entered by a magistrate judge in a dispositive matter, that is, a matter excepted by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), by filing a “Statement of Objection to Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation” within ten days after being served with a copy of the recommendation, unless a different time is established by order. The statement of objection shall specify those portions of the recommendation to which objection is made and the basis for the objection. The objecting party shall submit to the district judge, at the time of filing the objection, a brief setting forth the party’s arguments that the magistrate judge’s recommendation should be reviewed *de novo* and a different disposition made. It is insufficient to submit only a copy of the original brief submitted to the magistrate judge, although a copy of the original brief may be submitted or referred to and incorporated into the brief in support of the objection. Failure to submit a brief in support of the objection may be deemed an abandonment of the objection.

A magistrate judge's recommendation cannot be appealed to a Court of Appeals; only the district judge's order or judgment can be appealed.

2. **Transcript (applicable Where Proceedings Tape Recorded).** Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and FED.R.CIV.P. 72(b), the Magistrate Judge finds that the tapes and original records in this case are adequate for purposes of review. Any party planning to object to this recommendation, but unable to pay the fee for a transcript, is advised that a judicial determination that transcription is necessary is required before the United States will pay the cost of the transcript.

s/WILLIAM E. CASSADY \_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE