

1 **II. Discussion**

2 Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure . . . of a party to comply with these Rules or with
3 any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . .
4 within the inherent power of the Court.” District courts have the inherent power to control their
5 dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power they may impose sanctions including, where
6 appropriate, . . . dismissal.” Thompson v. Housing Auth., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A
7 court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action,
8 failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See, e.g., Ghazali v. Moran, 46
9 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet,
10 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring
11 amendment of complaint); Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv., 833 F.2d 128, 130–33 (9th Cir. 1987)
12 (dismissal for failure to comply with court order).

13 In determining whether to dismiss an action, the Court must consider several factors:
14 (1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court’s need to manage its
15 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of
16 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions. Henderson v. Duncan, 779
17 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 (9th Cir. 1988).

18 Here, the action has been pending since April 2016, and Plaintiff’s third amended
19 complaint is overdue. The Court cannot hold this case in abeyance awaiting such compliance by
20 Plaintiff. Thus, the Court finds that both the first and second factors weigh in favor of dismissal.

21 The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendant, also weighs in favor of dismissal, since a
22 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an action.
23 Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor usually weighs
24 against dismissal because public policy favors disposition on the merits. Pagtalunan v. Galaza,
25 291 F.3d 639, 643 (9th Cir. 2002). However, “this factor lends little support to a party whose
26 responsibility it is to move a case toward disposition on the merits but whose conduct impedes
27 progress in that direction,” which is the case here. In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab.
28 Litig., 460 F.3d 1217, 1228 (9th Cir. 2006) (citation omitted).

1 Finally, the court’s warning to a party that failure to obey the court’s order will result in
2 dismissal satisfies the “considerations of the alternatives” requirement. Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262;
3 Malone, 833 at 132–33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court’s May 30, 2018 order to show
4 cause expressly warned Plaintiff that failure to comply with that order would result in a dismissal
5 of this action, with prejudice, for failure to obey a court order and failure to prosecute. (ECF No.
6 55, p. 2.) Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal could result from his
7 noncompliance.

8 Additionally, at this stage in the proceedings there is little available to the Court which
9 would constitute a satisfactory lesser sanction while protecting the Court from further
10 unnecessary expenditure of its scarce resources. Plaintiff is proceeding *in forma pauperis* in this
11 action, making monetary sanctions of little use, and the preclusion of evidence or witnesses is
12 likely to have no effect given that Plaintiff has ceased litigating her case.

13 **III. Conclusion and Recommendation**

14 Accordingly, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed, with
15 prejudice, for failure to obey a court order and failure to prosecute.

16 These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District
17 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within
18 **fourteen (14) days** after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may
19 file written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned “Objections to
20 Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file
21 objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of the “right to challenge the
22 magistrate’s factual findings” on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir.
23 2014) (citing Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: July 9, 2018

26 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28