

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9                   EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 DANNY JAMES COHEA,

Case No. 1:13 -cv-01061-LJO-MJS

12                   Plaintiff,

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
FOR DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFF'S  
COMPLAINT FOR FAILURE TO OBEY A  
COURT ORDER

13                   v.

14 YOSSI CARRON, et al.

(ECF No. 5)

15                   Defendants.

OBJECTIONS DUE WITHIN FOURTEEN  
DAYS

16  
17                   Plaintiff Danny James Cohea ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in  
18 this civil rights actions pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.  
19

20                   On July 31, 2013, the Court found that Plaintiff was not eligible to proceed in  
21 forma pauperis status pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 because he had had three prior  
22 federal actions dismissed for failure to state a claim and was not under imminent  
23 danger of serious physical injury at the time the Complaint was filed. (ECF No. 5.)  
24 Plaintiff was to pay the \$400.00 filing fee in full by August 14, 2013. (*Id.*) In lieu of  
25 submitting the filing fee, Plaintiff filed a thirty-six page document objecting to the Court's  
26 July 31, 2013, order. (ECF No. 6.) Plaintiff has failed to obey the Court's July 31, 2013,  
27 order.  
28

1       Local Rule 110 provides that “failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these  
2 Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any  
3 and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” District courts have the  
4 inherent power to control their dockets and “in the exercise of that power, they may  
5 impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal of a case.” Thompson v.  
6 Housing Auth., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with  
7 prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order,  
8 or failure to comply with local rules. See, e.g., Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th  
9 Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d  
10 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring  
11 amendment of a complaint); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988)  
12 (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court  
13 apprised of address); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)  
14 (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d  
15 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with  
16 local rules).

17       In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to  
18 obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the Court must consider several  
19 factors: (1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court’s  
20 need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public  
21 policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic  
22 alternatives. Thompson, 782 F.2d at 831; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; Malone,  
23 833 F.2d at 130; Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53.

24       In the instant case, the Court finds that the public’s interest in expeditiously  
25 resolving this litigation and the Court’s interest in managing its docket weigh in favor of  
26 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of  
27 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable  
28 delay in prosecuting an action. Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir.

1 1976). The fourth factor -- public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits -- is  
2 greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a  
3 court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in dismissal  
4 satisfies the "consideration of alternatives" requirement. Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d at  
5 1262; Malone, 833 at 132-33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order  
6 expressly stated: "If Plaintiff fails to pay the \$400.00 filing fee in full within fourteen days,  
7 this action shall be dismissed, without prejudice." (ECF No. 6.) Thus, Plaintiff had  
8 adequate warning that dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the Court's  
9 order.

10 Based on the foregoing, the Court RECOMMENDS that this action be  
11 DISMISSED based on Plaintiff's failure to obey a court order.

12 These Findings and Recommendations are submitted to the United States  
13 District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. §  
14 636(b)(1). Within fourteen (14) days after being served with these Findings and  
15 Recommendations, any party may file written objections with the Court and serve a  
16 copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate  
17 Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The parties are advised that failure to file  
18 objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's  
19 order. Martinez v. Y1 st, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

20

21

22

IT IS SO ORDERED.

23

24

Dated: August 16, 2013

25

/s/ Michael J. Leng  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

26

27

28