

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 JASON SAUNDERS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 MATTHEW L. CATE, et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16  
17  
18

1:06-cv-01567-AWI-GSA-PC

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
TO DISMISS CASE FOR PLAINTIFF'S  
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT  
ORDER  
(Doc. 56.)

OBJECTIONS, IF ANY, DUE IN THIRTY  
DAYS

19 On October 8, 2013, the court issued an order requiring Plaintiff to either file a Fourth  
20 Amended Complaint or notify the court of his willingness to proceed with the claims found  
21 cognizable by the court, within thirty days. (Doc. 56.) To date, Plaintiff has requested and  
22 been granted four extensions of time to comply with the court's order. (Docs. 57-62.) The  
23 latest deadline to comply with the order has expired, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended  
24 complaint or a notice, or otherwise responded to the court's order.

25 In determining whether to dismiss this action for failure to comply with the directives  
26 set forth in its order, "the Court must weigh the following factors: (1) the public's interest in  
27 expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of  
28 prejudice to defendants/respondents; (4) the availability of less drastic alternatives; and (5) the

1 public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits.” Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d  
2 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)).

3 “The public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation always favors dismissal,”  
4 id. (quoting Yourish v. California Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 1999)), and here, the  
5 action has been pending since October 13, 2006. Plaintiff’s failure to respond to the Court’s  
6 order may reflect Plaintiff’s disinterest in prosecuting this case. In such an instance, the Court  
7 cannot continue to expend its scarce resources assisting a litigant who will not help himself by  
8 amending the complaint or notifying the court of his willingness to proceed. Thus, both the  
9 first and second factors weigh in favor of dismissal.

10 Turning to the risk of prejudice, “pendency of a lawsuit is not sufficiently prejudicial in  
11 and of itself to warrant dismissal.” Id. (citing Yourish at 991). However, “delay inherently  
12 increases the risk that witnesses’ memories will fade and evidence will become stale,” id., and it  
13 is Plaintiff’s failure to respond to the Court’s orders that is causing delay. Therefore, the third  
14 factor weighs in favor of dismissal.

15 As for the availability of lesser sanctions, at this stage in the proceedings there is little  
16 available to the Court which would constitute a satisfactory lesser sanction while protecting the  
17 Court from further unnecessary expenditure of its scarce resources. Plaintiff is proceeding in  
18 forma pauperis in this action, making monetary sanctions of little use, and given the early stage  
19 of these proceedings, the preclusion of evidence or witnesses is not available. However,  
20 inasmuch as the dismissal being considered in this case is without prejudice, the Court is  
21 stopping short of issuing the harshest possible sanction of dismissal with prejudice.

22 Finally, because public policy favors disposition on the merits, this factor will always  
23 weigh against dismissal. Id. at 643.

24 Accordingly, the court **HEREBY RECOMMENDS** that this action be dismissed  
25 without prejudice, based on Plaintiff’s failure to obey the court’s order of October 8, 2013.

26 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge  
27 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within thirty  
28 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, Plaintiff may file written

1 objections with the court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate  
2 Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections  
3 within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v.  
4 Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

5  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: June 9, 2014

/s/ Gary S. Austin  
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE