1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	KENNETH LOPEZ,	Case No. 1:19-cv-00794-DAD-SKO (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISMISS ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE
13	v.	
14	I. MEDINA, et al.,	14-DAY DEADLINE
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	On March 18, 2020, the Court issued a screening order finding that Plaintiff failed to state	
18	a cognizable claim and granting her leave to file a second amended complaint. (Doc. 15.)	
19	Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint. On April 14, 2020, Plaintiff filed a response to the	
20	Court's screening order, in which she states, "I repeat: I will not seek help from courts again. Any	
21	further correspondence from you will be refused." (Doc. 16.)	
22	The Local Rules, corresponding with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, provide,	
23	"[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with any order of the Court may be grounds for	
24	the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions within the inherent power of the Court."	
25	Local Rule 110. "District courts have inherent power to control their dockets" and, in exercising	
26	that power, may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. Thompson v. Housing Auth.,	
27		

¹ Plaintiff states that she suffers from gender dysphoria, identifies as female, and refers to herself with female pronouns. (*See* Doc. 1 at 14.) The Court, therefore, uses female pronouns to refer to Plaintiff.

1	City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a	
2	party's failure to prosecute an action, obey a court order, or comply with local rules. See, e.g.,	
3	Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with a	
4	court order to amend a complaint); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir.	
5	1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421,	
6	1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules).	
7	Per Plaintiff's response to the Court's screening order, Plaintiff has abandoned this action.	
8	Accordingly, the Court RECOMMENDS that this action be DISMISSED without prejudice for	
9	failure to prosecute.	
10	These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District	
11	Judge assigned to this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within 14 days	
12	of the date of service of these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may file written	
13	objections with the Court. The document should be captioned, "Objections to Magistrate Judge's	
14	Findings and Recommendations." Failure to file objections within the specified time may result in	
15	waiver of rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing	
16	Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).	
17		
18	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
19	Dated: April 20, 2020 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto	
20	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		