1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	WILLIAM DOUGLAS MELLO,	1:10-cv-00828-LJO-GSA-PC	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO RULE 41	
13	V.	(Doc. 10.)	
14	F. AGUIAR, et al.,	ORDER DISMISSING ACTION IN ITS ENTIRETY WITHOUT PREJUDICE	
15	Defendants.	ORDER DIRECTING CLERK TO CLOSE FILE	
16	/		
17			
18	I. BACKGROUND		
19	William Douglas Mello ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma		
20	pauperis in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed the complaint		
21	commencing this action on May 12, 2010. (Doc. 1.) On July 6, 2010, Plaintiff filed an amended		
22	complaint. (Doc. 9.) On July 26, 2012, the Court issued an order dismissing the amended		
23	complaint, for failure to state a claim, with leave to amend. (Doc. 15.)		
24	On August 13, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion to voluntarily dismiss this action. (Doc. 16.)		
25	II. RULE 41 DISMISSAL OF ACT	ION	
26	In <u>Wilson v. City of San Jose</u> , the Ninth Circuit explained:		
27	Under Rule $41(a)(1)$ , a plaintiff has an absolute right to voluntarily dismiss		
28	his action prior to service by the defendant of an answer or a motion for summary judgment. <u>Concha v. London</u> , 62 F.3d 1493, 1506 (9th Cir. 1995) (citing <u>Hamilton</u>		
	1		

1 2	v. Shearson-Lehman American Express, 813 F.2d 1532, 1534 (9th Cir. 1987)). A plaintiff may dismiss his action so long as the plaintiff files a notice of dismissal prior to the defendant's service of an answer or motion for summary judgment. The		
3			
4			
5	action as to the defendants who are the subjects of the notice. <u>Concha</u> , 62 F.2d at 1506. Unless otherwise stated, the dismissal is ordinarily without prejudice to the		
6	plaintiff's right to commence another action for the same cause against the same defendants. Id. (citing McKenzie v. Davenport-Harris Funeral Home, 834 F.2d 930, 034.35 (0th Cir. 1087)). Such a dismissional leaves the martine as though no action had		
7	934-35 (9th Cir. 1987)). Such a dismissal leaves the parties as though no action had been brought. Id.		
8	Wilson v. City of San Jose, 111 F.3d 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1997). No defendant has filed an answer or		
9	motion for summary judgment in this action. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion shall be granted.		
10	IV. CONCLUSION		
11		Accordingly, based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
12		1. Plaintiff's motion to voluntarily dismiss the complaint is GRANTED;	
13		2. This action is DISMISSED in its entirety without prejudice; and	
14		3. The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to close the file in this case and adjust the	
15		docket to reflect voluntary dismissal of this action pursuant to Rule 41(a).	
16			
17	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
18	B Dated: August 14, 2012 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill   UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
19		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		2	
	I	2	