

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

11 TROY LEON CLOWERS, JR.,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 MARGARET MIMS, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16
17
18

1:14-cv-01488-AWI-GSA-PC

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
TO DISMISS CASE FOR FAILURE TO
OBEY COURT ORDERS
(Docs. 2, 13.)

OBJECTIONS, IF ANY, DUE IN TWENTY
(20) DAYS

19 On September 24, 2014, and November 10, 2014, the Court issued orders requiring
20 Plaintiff to complete and return the Court's form indicating consent or decline of Magistrate
21 Judge jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), within thirty days. (Docs. 2, 13.) The most recent
22 thirty day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not submitted the Court's form.

23 In determining whether to dismiss this action for failure to comply with the directives
24 set forth in its order, "the Court must weigh the following factors: (1) the public's interest in
25 expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of
26 prejudice to defendants/respondents; (4) the availability of less drastic alternatives; and (5) the
27 public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits." Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d
28 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)).

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 September 24, 2014. 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 responding to court orders. Thus, both the first and second factors weigh in favor of dismissal.

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

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

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

21 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY RECOMMENDS that this action be dismissed based
22 on Plaintiff’s failure to obey the Court’s orders of September 24, 2014, and November 10, 2014.
23 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned
24 to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty (20) days
25 after being served with these findings and recommendations, Plaintiff may file written
26 objections with the court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate
27 Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections
28 within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler,

1 __ F.3d __, __, No. 11-17911, 2014 WL 6435497, at *3 (9th Cir. Nov. 18, 2014) (citing Baxter
2 v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

3
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: January 4, 2015

/s/ Gary S. Austin
6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE