

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 ARTHUR GASPARD, CASE NO. 1:08-cv-00581 LJO DLB PC
10 v. Plaintiff, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
11 WILLIAM J. McGUINNESS, et al., RECOMMENDING DISMISSAL OF ACTION
12 Defendants. (Doc. 6)
13 OBJECTIONS DUE WITHIN TWENTY DAYS

14
15 Plaintiff Arthur Gaspard (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma
16 pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action was filed on April 28,
17 2008. On November 13, 2008, the undersigned issued an order striking the complaint on the grounds
18 that the complaint was unsigned. Local Rule 7-131(b), F.R.C.P. 11(a). Plaintiff was ordered to file
19 a signed and complete amended complaint within 30 days of service of the order. To date, Plaintiff
20 has not complied with or otherwise responded to the Court’s order. As a result, there is no pleading
21 on file which sets forth any claims upon which relief may be granted under section 1983.
22

23 Local Rule 11-110 provides that “failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Local
24 Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all
25 sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” District courts have the inherent power to
26 control their dockets and “in the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where
27 appropriate . . . dismissal of a case.” Thompson v. Housing Auth., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir.
28 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an

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

9 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court
10 order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's
11 interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk
12 of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and
13 (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. Thompson, 782 F.2d at 831; Henderson, 779 F.2d at
14 1423-24; Malone, 833 F.2d at 130; Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; Ghazali, 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, as this case has
17 been pending since April 28, 2008. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs
18 in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay
19 in prosecuting an action. Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth
20 factor -- public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits -- is greatly outweighed by the
21 factors in favor of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure
22 to obey the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"
23 requirement. Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d at 1262; Malone, 833 at 132-33; Henderson, 779 F.2d
24 at 1424. The court's order requiring plaintiff to file an amended complaint expressly stated: "Failure
25 to comply with this order will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed for failure
26 to obey a court order.." Thus, plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would result from his
27 noncompliance with the court's order.

28 ///

Accordingly, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to obey a court order.

These Findings and Recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within **twenty (20) days** after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. Such a document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 7, 2009

/s/ **Dennis L. Beck**
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE