

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

7 LAMAR JOHNSON,

8 Plaintiff,

9 vs.

10 NORM KRAMER, et al.,

11 Defendants.  
12

1:15-cv-01338-LJO-GSA-PC

ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF  
VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL UNDER  
RULE 41  
(ECF No. 15.)

ORDER DIRECTING CLERK TO CLOSE  
FILE

13 Lamar Johnson ("Plaintiff") is a civil detainee proceeding pro se in this civil rights  
14 action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed the Complaint commencing this action on  
15 January 8, 2015. (ECF No. 1.)

16 On April 26, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion to voluntarily dismiss this case without  
17 prejudice. (ECF No. 15.) The court construes Plaintiff's motion as a notice of dismissal under  
18 Rule 41(a)(1). In Wilson v. City of San Jose, the Ninth Circuit explained:

19 Under Rule 41(a)(1), a plaintiff has an absolute right to voluntarily  
20 dismiss his action prior to service by the defendant of an answer or a motion for  
21 summary judgment. Concha v. London, 62 F.3d 1493, 1506 (9th Cir. 1995)  
22 (citing Hamilton v. Shearson-Lehman American Express, 813 F.2d 1532, 1534  
23 (9th Cir. 1987)). A plaintiff may dismiss his action so long as the plaintiff files  
24 a notice of dismissal prior to the defendant's service of an answer or motion for  
25 summary judgment. The dismissal is effective on filing and no court order is  
26 required. Id. The plaintiff may dismiss some or all of the defendants, or some  
27 or all of his claims, through a Rule 41(a)(1) notice. Id.; Pedrina v. Chun, 987  
28 F.2d 608, 609-10 (9th Cir. 1993). The filing of a notice of voluntary dismissal  
with the court automatically terminates the action as to the defendants who are  
the subjects of the notice. Concha, 62 F.2d at 1506. Unless otherwise stated,  
the dismissal is ordinarily without prejudice to the plaintiff's right to commence  
another action for the same cause against the same defendants. Id. (citing  
McKenzie v. Davenport-Harris Funeral Home, 834 F.2d 930, 934-35 (9th Cir.  
1987)). Such a dismissal leaves the parties as though no action had been  
brought. Id.

1 Wilson v. City of San Jose, 111 F.3d 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1997). In this case, no defendant has  
2 filed an answer or motion for summary judgment in this action. Therefore, Plaintiff's notice of  
3 dismissal is effective, and this case shall be closed.

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 5 1. Plaintiff's notice of dismissal is effective as of the date it was filed;
- 6 2. This action is DISMISSED in its entirety without prejudice; and
- 7 3. The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to close the file in this case and adjust the  
8 docket to reflect voluntary dismissal of this action pursuant to Rule 41(a).

9  
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: April 27, 2017

12 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill  
13 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28