

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

9  
10 JASON C. DAVIDSON,

11 Plaintiff,

12 vs.

13 J. LOPEZ,

14 Defendant  
15

Case No.1:14 cv 01863 LJO GSA PC

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION  
THAT THIS ACTION BE DISMISSED FOR  
FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND FAILURE  
TO OBEY A COURT ORDER

OBJECTIONS DUE IN TWENTY DAYS  
16

17  
18 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action . The matter was  
19 referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local  
20 Rule 302.

21 On November 24, 2014, an order was entered, severing this action and directing Plaintiff  
22 to file an amended complaint and application to proceed in forma pauperis. Plaintiff was  
23 specifically cautioned that his failure to comply could result in dismissal for failure to obey a  
24 court order. Plaintiff has not filed a response to the November 24, 2014, order.

25 Local Rule 110 provides that “failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Local  
26 Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and  
27 all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” District courts have the inherent power  
28 to control their dockets and “in the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including,

1 where appropriate . . . dismissal of a case.” Thompson v. Housing Auth., 782 f.2d 829, 831 (9<sup>th</sup>  
2 Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute  
3 an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See, e.g., Ghazali v.  
4 Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995)(dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v.  
5 Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992)(dismissal for failure to comply with an order  
6 requiring amendment of complaint); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
7 1988)(dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court  
8 apprised of address(; Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987)(dismissal  
9 for failure to comply with court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
10 1986)(dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

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

18 Here, the Court finds that the public’s interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation  
19 and the Court’s interest in managing the docket weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor,  
20 risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury  
21 arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an action. Anderson v. Air West,  
22 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1976). The fourth factor – public policy favoring disposition of cases  
23 on the merits – is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of dismissal discussed herein.  
24 Finally, a court’s warning to a party that his failure to obey the court’s order will result in  
25 dismissal satisfies the “consideration of alternatives” requirement. Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262;  
26 Malone, 833 F.2d at 132-33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424.

27 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed for

