

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CURTIS MCAFEE,

Plaintiff,

V.

PARKWAY INN MOTEL, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:17 -cv-01372-DAD-SAB

FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS
RECOMMENDING DISMISSING ACTION
FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM AND
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT
ORDER

OBJECTIONS DUE WITHIN TWENTY-ONE DAYS

Plaintiff Curtis McAfee (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on October 12, 2017. (ECF No. 1.) The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On October 17, 2017, Plaintiff's complaint was screened by the undersigned and an order was filed dismissing the complaint with leave to amend for failure to state a claim. (ECF No. 4.) Plaintiff was ordered to file an amended complaint within thirty days of the October 17, 2017 order. More than thirty days have passed and Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the October 17, 2017 order.

Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the inherent power to

1 control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate,
2 including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir.
3 2000).

4 A court may dismiss an action based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to
5 obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See, e.g. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52,
6 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d
7 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order to file an amended
8 complaint); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to
9 comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); Malone v.
10 United States Postal Serv., 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply
11 with court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack
12 of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

13 In determining whether to dismiss an action for failure to comply with a pretrial order,
14 the Court must weigh "(1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the
15 court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public
16 policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic
17 sanctions." In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226
18 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal quotations and citations omitted). These factors guide a court in
19 deciding what to do, and are not conditions that must be met in order for a court to take action.
20 Id. (citation omitted).

21 In this instance the public's interest in expeditious resolution of the litigation and the
22 Court's need to manage its docket weigh in favor of dismissal. Id. Plaintiff was ordered to file
23 an amended complaint within thirty days of October 17, 2017. Plaintiff has been provided with
24 the legal standards that would apply to his claims and the opportunity to file an amended
25 complaint. Plaintiff has neither filed an amended complaint nor otherwise responded to the
26 Court's order. Plaintiff's failure to comply with the orders of the Court hinders the Court's
27 ability to move this action towards disposition, and indicates that Plaintiff does not intend to
28 diligently litigate this action.

1 Since it appears that Plaintiff does not intend to litigate this action diligently there arises a
2 rebuttable presumption of prejudice to the defendants in this action. In re Eisen, 31 F.3d 1447,
3 1452-53 (9th Cir. 1994). This risk of prejudice may be rebutted if Plaintiff offers an excuse for
4 the delay. In re Eisen, 31 F.3d at 1453. The risk of prejudice to the defendants also weighs in
5 favor of dismissal.

6 The public policy in favor of deciding cases on their merits is greatly outweighed by the
7 factors in favor of dismissal. It is Plaintiff's responsibility to move this action forward. This
8 action can proceed no further without Plaintiff's cooperation and compliance with the order at
9 issue, and the action cannot simply remain idle on the Court's docket, unprosecuted. In this
10 instance, the fourth factor does not outweigh Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's orders.

11 Finally, a court's warning to a party that their failure to obey the court's order will result
12 in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives" requirement. Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262;
13 Malone, 833 at 132-33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court's October 17, 2017 order
14 requiring Plaintiff to file an amended complaint expressly stated: "If Plaintiff fails to file an
15 amended complaint in compliance with this order, this action will be dismissed for failure to state a
16 claim." (ECF No. 4 at 6:19-20.) Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would
17 result from his noncompliance with the Court's order and his failure to state a claim.

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 //

27 ///

28 ///

1 Accordingly, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be DISMISSED for
2 Plaintiff's failure to state a claim and failure to comply with a court order.

3 This findings and recommendations is submitted to the district judge assigned to this
4 action, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and this Court's Local Rule 304. Within twenty-
5 one (21) days of service of this recommendation, Plaintiff may file written objections to this
6 findings and recommendations with the Court. Such a document should be captioned
7 "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The district judge will
8 review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
9 636(b)(1)(C). Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may
10 result in the waiver of rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014)
11 (citing Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: November 21, 2017



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28