1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 6 7 8 9		ES DISTRICT COURT RICT OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11	DONNELL WEBB,	CASE NO. 1:14-cv-1528-MJS (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DISMISSING ACTION WITH
13	v.	PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM, FAILURE TO OBEY A COURT
14 15 16 17	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION, Defendant.	ORDER, AND FAILURE TO PROSECUTE (ECF Nos. 21, 22) CLERK TO TERMINATE PENDING MOTIONS AND CLOSE CASE
18	Plaintiff is a former state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this	
19	civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has consented to	
20	Magistrate Judge jurisdiction. No other parties have appeared in the action.	
21	On April 13, 2015, Plaintiff's first amended complaint was dismissed for failure to	
22	state a claim, but he was given leave to amend. (ECF No. 21.) Plaintiff did not file an	
23	amended pleading in the time provided and, on May 28, 2015, the Court ordered Plaintiff	
24	to show cause why the action should not be dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to state	
25	a claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to obey a court order. (ECF No. 22.) Plaintiff did	
26	not respond to the order to show cause.	
27	Local Rule 110 provides that "failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these	
28		

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

In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey
a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, 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 defendants, (4) the public policy
favoring disposition of cases on their merits, and (5) the availability of less drastic
alternatives. <u>Thompson</u>, 782 F.2d at 831; <u>Henderson</u>, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; <u>Malone</u>, 833
F.2d at 130; <u>Ferdik</u>, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; <u>Ghazali</u>, 46 F.3d at 53.

In the instant case, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing its docket weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting this action. <u>Anderson v. Air West</u>, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor – public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits – is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, as for the availability of lesser

1	sanctions, at this stage in the proceedings there is little available which would constitute	
2	a satisfactory lesser sanction while preserving scarce Court resources. Plaintiff is likely	
3	unable to pay monetary sanctions, making such sanctions of little use.	
4	Based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:	
5	1. The action is dismissed, with prejudice, for failure to state a claim, failure	
6	to obey a court order, and failure to prosecute;	
7	2. Dismissal counts as a strike pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g); and	
8	3. The Clerk's Office is directed to terminate any and all pending motions and	
9	to close the case.	
10		
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
12	Dated: <u>June 26, 2015</u> Isl Michael J. Seng	
13	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	3	