

1 Here, while this case has not been pending long, the public has a great interest in the
2 expeditious resolution of this and all litigation heard here, as it has one of the busiest dockets in
3 the country. *See Ellis v. Checkmate Staffing, Inc.*, No. 2:08-cv-00129-JAM-CKD, 2015 WL
4 351441, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2015). For similar reasons, the court has a strong need to
5 control its docket. There is little risk of prejudice to the defendants in this action, who have not
6 yet appeared in this matter, given the high likelihood this court does not have subject matter
7 jurisdiction over the dispute in any event. (*See* Doc. No. 4.) There are no less drastic alternatives
8 available to the court when faced with a litigant who simply fails to respond to court orders.
9 Finally, while public policy may favor disposing of cases on the merits, it is highly unlikely this
10 court would be able to reach the actual dispute—whether defendants engaged in “dual tracking”
11 in violation of the California Homeowner Bill of Rights—given that it appears to lack subject
12 matter jurisdiction.

13 Therefore, considering the factors noted above and that the deadline to respond to the
14 court’s order to show cause has passed without response from the plaintiff, the court dismisses
15 this case without leave to amend. Plaintiff’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 3) is
16 denied as having been rendered moot by this order. Finally, the Clerk of the Court is directed to
17 close this case.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: June 30, 2017

20 
21 _____
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28