



1 Housing Auth., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with  
2 prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute, failure to obey a court order, or failure  
3 to comply with local rules. See, e.g., Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995)  
4 (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-  
5 61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of a  
6 complaint); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure  
7 to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address);  
8 Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to  
9 comply with a court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)  
10 (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  
12 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the Court must consider several  
13 factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation, (2) the Court's need  
14 to manage its docket, (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants, (4) the public policy  
15 favoring disposition of cases on their merits, and (5) the availability of less drastic  
16 alternatives. Thompson, 782 F.2d at 831; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; Malone, 833  
17 F.2d at 130; Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53.

18 In the instant case, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation  
19 and the Court's interest in managing its docket weigh in favor of dismissal. The third  
20 factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal, since a  
21 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting  
22 this action. Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor --  
23 public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits -- is greatly outweighed by the  
24 factors in favor of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, as for the availability of lesser  
25 sanctions, at this stage in the proceedings there is little available which would constitute  
26 a satisfactory lesser sanction while preserving scarce Court resources. Plaintiff has not  
27 paid the filing fee for this action and is likely unable to pay, making monetary sanctions  
28 of little use.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. Within fourteen (14) days of service of this Order, Plaintiff shall file either an amended complaint or notice of willingness to proceed, or shall show cause as to why this action should not be dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with the Court's order (ECF No. 11); and
2. If Plaintiff fails to show cause or file an amended complaint or notice of willingness to proceed, the undersigned will dismiss this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 28, 2017

*/s/ Michael J. Seng*  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE