



1 As noted in the order to show cause, the Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P.  
2 11, provide, “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be  
3 grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of  
4 the Court.” Local Rule 110. “District courts have inherent power to control their dockets,” and  
5 in exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action.  
6 *Thompson v. Housing Authority of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may  
7 dismiss an action with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action or failure to  
8 obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d  
9 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring  
10 amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)  
11 (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424  
12 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules). Plaintiff  
13 appears to have abandoned this action, justifying dismissal.

14 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice  
15 based on Plaintiff’s failure to state a cognizable claim, and Plaintiff’s failure to prosecute this  
16 action and obey the Court’s June 2, 2017, and August 21, 2017, orders.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18  
19 Dated: October 3, 2017

/s/ Sheila K. Olerto  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE