## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA SOUTHERN DIVISION

| WENDY WILLIAMS,           | )                                 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Plaintiff,                | )<br>)                            |
| vs.                       | ) CIV. ACT. NO. 1:23-cv-308-TFM-B |
| LINDA DARRINGTON, et al., | )                                 |
| Defendants.               | )                                 |

## **MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

On September 8, 2023, the Magistrate Judge entered a report and recommendation which recommends this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute and to comply with the court's orders. *See* Doc. 7. No objections were filed; however, Plaintiff did file several other documents which were ultimately stricken by the Magistrate Judge. *See* Docs. 8, 9, 10. Regardless, the Court did take a look at the full docket before issuing this opinion.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) authorizes dismissal of a complaint for failure to prosecute or failure to comply with a court order or the federal rules. *Gratton v. Great Am. Commc'ns*, 178 F.3d 1373, 1374 (11th Cir. 1999). Further, such a dismissal may be done on motion of the defendant or *sua sponte* as an inherent power of the court. *Betty K Agencies, Ltd. v. M/V Monada*, 432 F.3d 1333, 1337 (11th Cir. 2005). "[D]ismissal upon disregard of an order, especially where the litigant has been forewarned, generally is not an abuse of discretion." *Vil v. Perimeter Mortg. Funding Corp.*, 715 F. App'x 912, 915 (quoting *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989)). "[E]ven a non-lawyer should realize the peril to [his] case, when [he] . . . ignores numerous notices" and fails to comply with court orders. *Anthony v. Marion Cty. Gen. Hosp.*, 617 F.2d 1164, 1169 (5th Cir. 1980); *see also Moon*, 863 F.2d at 837 (As a general rule, where a litigant has been forewarned,

dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion.). Therefore, the Court

finds it appropriate to exercise its "inherent power" to "dismiss [Plaintiff's claims] sua sponte for

lack of prosecution." Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 8 L. Ed. 2d 734

(1962); see also Betty K Agencies, Ltd., 432 F.3d at 1337 (describing the judicial power to dismiss

sua sponte for failure to comply with court orders).

Since the filing of her complaint, Plaintiff was told to pay the filing fee or a file a motion

to proceed in forma pauperis. See Doc. 3. Instead of complying, Plaintiff simply files additional

documents and ignores the directive. Even after the Magistrate Judge issued the Report and

Recommendation once again noting the deficiency, Plaintiff still failed to comply. To this date,

there is been no payment of the filing fee nor has she filed a motion to proceed without the

prepayment of fees. She was also warned that the failure to comply could result in the dismissal

of her action.

Accordingly, after due and proper consideration of all portions of this file deemed relevant

to the issues raised, and there having been no objections filed, the Report and Recommendation of

the Magistrate Judge is **ADOPTED** and this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for failure

to prosecute and obey the Court's orders.

A separate judgment will issue pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

**DONE** and **ORDERED** this 2nd day of November, 2023.

/s/Terry F. Moorer

TERRY F. MOORER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Page 2 of 2