

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LUMPKIN WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

1:06 CV 01569 AWI YNP GSA (PC)

FINDING S AND RECOMMENDATION

GARZA, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On January 12, 2010, Plaintiff was directed to complete and return to the court a completed USM 285 form for Defendant Mendoza. Plaintiff has failed to do so.

Local Rule 110 provides that “failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Local Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “in the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal of a case.” Thompson v. Housing Auth., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See, e.g. Ghazali v.

1 Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995)(dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v.  
2 Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order  
3 requiring amendment of complaint); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
4 1988)(dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court  
5 apprised of address); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987)(dismissal  
6 for failure to comply with court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
7 1986)(dismissal for failure to lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

8 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a  
9 court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the  
10 public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket;  
11 (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on  
12 their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. Thompson, 782 F.2d at 831;  
13 Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; Malone, 833 F.2d at 130; Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; Ghazali,  
14 46 F.3d at 53.

15 In the instant case, the court finds that the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this  
16 litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket weigh in favor of dismissal. The third  
17 factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of  
18 injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an action. Anderson v.  
19 Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1976). The fourth factor -- public policy favoring  
20 disposition of cases on their merits -- is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of dismissal  
21 discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order  
22 will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives" requirement. Ferdik v.  
23 Bonzelet, 963 F.2d at 1262; Malone, 833 at 132-33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424.

24 Accordingly, the court HEREBY RECOMMENDS that this action be dismissed for  
25 plaintiff's failure to obey a court order.  
26

