

1 he consents to magistrate judge jurisdiction and filing the form provided in those orders. Instead
2 of filing a response to the OSC, on February 20, 2018, Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal which the
3 Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. (Docs. 11, 14, 15.)

4 Following dismissal of Plaintiff's appeal, on May 4, 2018, Plaintiff filed a document titled
5 "Motion in Compliance to the Magistrate Order." (Doc. 16.) Plaintiff contends the Clerk's
6 Office erred by not transmitting final orders in this case to the Ninth Circuit. Plaintiff contends
7 that this Court did not thoroughly review Plaintiff's original complaint in this action. Plaintiff
8 also contends that other magistrate judges have not thoroughly reviewed his pleadings in a
9 number of other actions which he lists. Ultimately, Plaintiff requests that he either be allowed to
10 proceed on the original complaint in this action, or that a final order issue upon which he can file
11 an appeal.

12 For the reasons discussed in the order that screened the Complaint and granted Plaintiff
13 leave to file an amended complaint, (Doc. 8), Plaintiff has not stated a cognizable claim and
14 should not be allowed to proceed on his original complaint. Further, despite having extended
15 opportunity to file an amended complaint, Plaintiff has not done so.

16 The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide, "[f]ailure of counsel or
17 of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the
18 Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court." Local Rule 110.
19 "District courts have inherent power to control their dockets," and in exercising that power, a
20 court may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. *Thompson v. Housing Authority of*
21 *Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action with prejudice,
22 based on a party's failure to prosecute an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure to
23 comply with local rules. *See, e.g. Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)
24 (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S.*
25 *Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court
26 order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to
27 prosecute and to comply with local rules).

28 //

