1		
2		
3		
4 5		
6		
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	MARTIN D. MILLER,	1:10-cv-01173-OWW-JLT HC
12		
13	Petitioner,	 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISMISS PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (Doc. 1)
14	V.) ORDER DIRECTING THAT OBJECTIONS
15 16	L. S. McEWEN, Warden,) BE FILED WITHIN TWENTY DAYS
10	Respondent.	
18	·	
19		
20		
21	of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.	
22	DISCUSSION	
23	On June 17, 2010, Petitioner filed the instant habeas petition in the Sacramento Division of	
24	this Court. (Doc. 1). On June 29, 2010, the case was transferred to the Fresno Division. (Doc. 3).	
25	On July 23, 2010, the Court issued an order requiring Petitioner to amend his petition within thirty	
26	days of the date of service of the order to amend. (Doc. 9). More than the thirty-day period has	
27	passed, and Petitioner has failed to comply with, or otherwise respond to, the Court's order.	
28	In determining whether to dismiss an	action for lack of prosecution, the court must consider

several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to
 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the Respondents; (4) the public policy favoring
 disposition of cases on their merits; and, (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. <u>Henderson v.</u>
 <u>Duncan</u>, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986); <u>Carey v. King</u>, 856 F.2d 1439 (9th Cir. 1988).

5 The Court finds that the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the 6 Court's interest in managing the docket weigh in favor of dismissal, as this case has been pending 7 since June 17, 2010. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Respondent, also weighs in favor of 8 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an action. Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor --9 10 public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits -- is greatly outweighed by the factors in 11 favor of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that failure to obey the 12 court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives" requirement. Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d at 1262; Malone, 833 at 132-33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court's 13 order of July 23, 2010, expressly stated: "Petitioner is forewarned that his failure to comply with this 14 15 order may result in a Recommendation that the petition be dismissed pursuant to Local Rule 110." 16 (Doc. 9, p. 4). Thus, Petitioner had adequate warning that dismissal would result from his 17 noncompliance with the Court's order.

RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, the Court HEREBY RECOMMENDS that the petition for writ ofhabeas corpus (Doc. 1), be DISMISSED for Petitioner's failure to prosecute.

18

21 This Findings and Recommendation is submitted to the United States District Court Judge 22 assigned to the case pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Rule 304 of the 23 Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court, Eastern District of California. Within 24 twenty (20) days after being served with a copy, any party may file written objections with the Court 25 and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Replies to the objections shall be served and filed within 26 27 ten (10) court days (plus three days if served by mail) after service of the objections. The Court will 28 then review the Magistrate Judge's ruling pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C). The parties are

1	advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the	
2		
3		
4	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
5	Dated:September 16, 2010/s/ Jennifer L. ThurstonUNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
6	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22 23		
23 24		
24		
26		
27		
28		
	3	