

JS-6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV 17-1299 PA (PLAx) Date July 26, 2017

Title Joederick S. Reguyal v. John Kelly, Sec’y of Dep’t of Homeland Sec., et al.

Present: The Honorable PERCY ANDERSON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Kamilla Sali-Suleyman

N/A

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

None

None

Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS—ORDER

Plaintiff Joederick S. Reguyal (“Plaintiff”) filed a Complaint with this Court on February 18, 2017. On July 7, 2017, the Court issued an Order to Show Cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution in light of Plaintiff’s failure to timely serve defendants John Kelly, Leon Rodriguez, Donald Neufeld, Corrina Luna, Susan M. Curda, and James Comey (“Defendants”). (Docket No. 16.) The Order specifically warned Plaintiff that the Court may dismiss the action for failure to respond by July 21, 2017. (*Id.*) To date, and despite the expiration of the deadline to do so, Plaintiff has not filed a response.

The Court may dismiss with prejudice an action or claim sua sponte if “the plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with the [Federal Rules of Civil Procedure] or a court order.” See Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b); Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629–30, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 1388, 8 L. Ed. 2d 734 (1962) (dismissal for failure to prosecute); Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 987–88 (9th Cir. 1999) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order). This inherent power supports the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases. See Link, 370 U.S. at 629–30, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 1388–89, 8 L. Ed. 2d 734; Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992); Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 987–88 (9th Cir. 1999).

In Henderson v. Duncan, the Ninth Circuit set forth five factors for a district court to consider before resorting to the penalty of dismissal: “(1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions.” 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986). Dismissal is appropriate “where at least four factors support dismissal, or where at least three factors ‘strongly’ support dismissal.” Hernandez v. City of El Monte, 138 F.3d 393, 399 (9th Cir. 1998) (internal citations omitted) (citing Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1263). Cases involving sua sponte dismissal merit special focus on the fifth Henderson factor. *Id.*

Here, in assessing the first Henderson factor, the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation will be satisfied by a dismissal. See Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Yourish, 191 F.3d at 990 (public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation always favors

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 17-1299 PA (PLAx)	Date	July 26, 2017
Title	Joederick S. Reguyal v. John Kelly, Sec’y of Dep’t of Homeland Sec., et al.		

dismissal)). Relatedly, with respect to the second factor, the Court’s need to manage its docket will be served by dismissal. See id.

The third Henderson factor at least marginally favors dismissal. Defendant may be further prejudiced unless the complaint is dismissed. See Yourish, 191 F.3d at 991; Pagtalunan, 291 F.3d at 642 (holding that failure to timely amend risks prejudice and can justify dismissal).

In considering the fourth and fifth Henderson factors, the Court notes that Plaintiff was warned about the consequences of failing to file a response by the date set by the Court. Nevertheless, Plaintiff has taken no action whatsoever. It therefore appears that Plaintiff has abandoned his efforts to obtain a judgment on the merits. Additionally, the Court intends to dismiss this action without prejudice. Accordingly, the fifth Henderson factor favors dismissal because the Court has adopted the “less-drastic” sanction of dismissal without prejudice. See McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 1996) (district court should first consider less drastic alternatives to dismissal with prejudice).

The Court finds that Plaintiff has abandoned this action. The Court therefore dismisses this action without prejudice for lack of prosecution. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); see also Yourish, 191 F.3d at 986–88; Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260.

IT IS SO ORDERED.