

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

11 BERTRAM COLIN JOHNSON,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 SIX UNKNOWN NAMES AGENTS,
15 et al.,

16 Defendants.

1:13-cv-01607-AWI-GSA-PC

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
TO DISMISS CASE FOR PLAINTIFF'S
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT
ORDER
(Doc. 4.)

OBJECTIONS, IF ANY, DUE IN THIRTY
DAYS

17 On October 22, 2013, the court issued an order requiring plaintiff to file a signed
18 complaint, and either submit an application to proceed in forma pauperis or pay the filing fee
19 for this action, within thirty days. (Doc. 4.) The thirty day time period has expired, and
20 plaintiff has not filed a signed complaint, paid the filing fee, submitted an application, or
21 otherwise responded to the court's order.

22 In determining whether to dismiss this action for failure to comply with the directives
23 set forth in its order, "the Court must weigh the following factors: (1) the public's interest in
24 expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of
25 prejudice to defendants/respondents; (4) the availability of less drastic alternatives; and (5) the
26 public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits." Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d
27 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)).

28 ///

1 “The public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation always favors dismissal,”
2 id. (quoting Yourish v. California Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 1999)), and here, the
3 action has been pending since October 7, 2013. Plaintiff’s failure to respond to the Court’s
4 order may reflect Plaintiff’s disinterest in prosecuting this case. In such an instance, the Court
5 cannot continue to expend its scarce resources assisting a litigant who will not help himself by
6 filing a signed complaint and resolving payment of the filing fee for his lawsuit, pursuant to the
7 Court’s order. Thus, both the first and second factors weigh in favor of dismissal.

8 Turning to the risk of prejudice, “pendency of a lawsuit is not sufficiently prejudicial in
9 and of itself to warrant dismissal.” Id. (citing Yourish at 991). However, “delay inherently
10 increases the risk that witnesses’ memories will fade and evidence will become stale,” id., and it
11 is Plaintiff’s failure to respond to the Court’s order that is causing delay. Therefore, the third
12 factor weighs in favor of dismissal.

13 As for the availability of lesser sanctions, at this stage in the proceedings there is little
14 available to the Court which would constitute a satisfactory lesser sanction while protecting the
15 Court from further unnecessary expenditure of its scarce resources. Plaintiff has not paid the
16 filing fee for this action, making it likely that Plaintiff is indigent, which would make monetary
17 sanctions of little use, and given the early stage of these proceedings, the preclusion of
18 evidence or witnesses is not available. However, inasmuch as the dismissal being considered in
19 this case is without prejudice, the Court is stopping short of issuing the harshest possible
20 sanction of dismissal with prejudice.

21 Finally, because public policy favors disposition on the merits, this factor will always
22 weigh against dismissal. Id. at 643.

23 Accordingly, the court **HEREBY RECOMMENDS** that this action be dismissed
24 without prejudice, based on plaintiff’s failure to obey the Court’s order of October 22, 2013.

25 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge
26 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within thirty
27 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written
28 objections with the court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate

1 Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections
2 within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v.
3 Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
4
5

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.
7

8 Dated: December 6, 2013

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28