Hoga v.	Hoga
---------	------

1	WO	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7		
8	Shawn Michael Hogo	No. CV-18-01119-PHX-JAT
9 10	Shawn Michael Hoga,	
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER
11	V.	
12	Shawn Michael Hoga,	
13	Defendant.	
14		
15		
16		
17	to the Court's show cause order. Further, Plaintiff's mail is being returned as	
18	undeliverable. (Doc. 8).	
19		
20		
21	P. 41(b). Given that the Court cannot contact Plaintiff, the only available remedy is to	
22	dismiss Plaintiff's case.	
23	Before dismissing an action for lack of prosecution, the Court must weigh several	
24	factors: "(1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's	
25	need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public	
26	policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits and (5) the availability of less drastic	
27	sanctions." Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir.1986). Here, factors one	
28	and two favor dismissal. Factor two furthe	er favors dismissal because it is Plaintiff's

obligation to keep his address current. Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 -1441 (9th Cir. 1988). Factor four does not favor dismissal. Factor three is neutral because Plaintiff appears to be suing himself. Factor five favors the less drastic sanction of dismissal without prejudice. Having weighed the factors, the Court will dismiss without prejudice. Therefore, IT IS ORDERED that this case is dismissed, without prejudice, and the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment accordingly. Dated this 9th day of August, 2018. James A. Teilborg Senior United States District Judge