

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ERIC LAVELLE WILLIAMS

1:09-cv-02102-SMS (PC)

Plaintiff,

ORDER DISMISSING CASE FOR FAILURE
TO OBEY A COURT ORDER

vs.

(Doc. 10.)

UNKNOWN, et al,

ORDER FOR THIS DISMISSAL TO COUNT
AS A STRIKE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C.
§1915(g)

Defendants.

_____ /

On March 25, 2010, the Court issued an order Dismissing Complaint with leave to Amend, within thirty (30) days. (Doc. 10.) The thirty (30)-day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court’s order.

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 (9th 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. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995)(dismissal for noncompliance with

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

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

15 In the instant case, the Court finds that the public’s interest in expeditiously
16 resolving this litigation and the court’s interest in managing the docket weigh in favor of
17 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal,
18 since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an
19 action. Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor -- public
20 policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits -- is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor
21 of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court’s warning to a party that his failure to obey the
22 court’s order will result in dismissal satisfies the “consideration of alternatives” requirement.
23 Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d at 1262; Malone, 833 at 132-33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424. The
24 court’s order expressly stated: “If Plaintiff fails to comply with this order, this action will be
25 dismissed for failure to obey a court order and for failure to state a claim.” Thus, Plaintiff had
26 adequate warning that dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the court’s order.

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 2 1. This action is dismissed with prejudice based on Plaintiff's failure to obey the
3 Court's order of March 24, 2010 and for failure to state a federal claim;
4 2. This dismissal shall count as a strike pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915; and
5 3. The Clerk of the Court is ordered to close this action.

6
7
8
9
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 **Dated: May 17, 2010**

/s/ Sandra M. Snyder
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE