

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8  
9 RODNEY VINCENT DOVE,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 MERCED COUNTY DISTRICT  
13 ATTORNEY OFFICE, et al.,

14 Defendants.

Case No. 1:23-cv-00586-SAB (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT  
TO RANDOMLY ASSIGN A DISTRICT  
JUDGE TO THIS ACTION

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION  
RECOMMENDING DISMISSAL OF THE  
ACTION

(ECF No. 6)

15  
16 Plaintiff Rodney Vincent Dove is proceeding pro se in this civil rights action filed pursuant  
17 to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

18 **I.**

19 **BACKGROUND**

20 Plaintiff filed the instant action on April 10, 2023. On April 18, 2023, the Court  
21 directed Plaintiff to submit an application to proceed in forma pauperis or pay the \$402.00 filing  
22 fee. (ECF No. 5.) Plaintiff failed to respond to the Court's April 18, 2023 order. Therefore, on  
23 June 12, 2023, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause within fourteen days why the action  
24 should not be dismissed. (ECF No. 6.) Plaintiff has not responded to the order to show cause  
25 and the time to do so has passed. Accordingly, dismissal is warranted.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **II.**

2 **LEGAL STANDARD**

3 Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure...of a party to comply with these Rules or with any  
4 order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions...within  
5 the inherent power of the Court.” District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets  
6 and “[i]n the exercise of that power they may impose sanctions including, where  
7 appropriate,...dismissal.” Thompson v. Hous. Auth., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

8 A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an  
9 action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See, e.g., Ghazali v.  
10 Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik  
11 v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an  
12 order requiring amendment of complaint); Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv., 833 F.2d 128, 130–33  
13 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order).

14 In determining whether to dismiss an action, the Court must consider several factors: (1)  
15 the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court's need to manage its  
16 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of  
17 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions. Henderson v. Duncan, 779  
18 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 (9th Cir. 1988).

19 **III.**

20 **DISCUSSION**

21 Here, Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis is overdue, he has not paid the  
22 filing fee for this action, and he has failed to comply with the Court's order. The Court cannot  
23 effectively manage its docket if Plaintiff ceases litigating his case. Thus, the Court finds that  
24 both the first and second factors weigh in favor of dismissal.

25 The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendant, also weighs in favor of dismissal, since a  
26 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an action.  
27 Anderson v. Air W., 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor usually weighs against  
28 dismissal because public policy favors disposition on the merits. Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d

1 639, 643 (9th Cir. 2002). However, “this factor lends little support to a party whose  
2 responsibility it is to move a case toward disposition on the merits but whose conduct impedes  
3 progress in that direction,” which is the case here. In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products  
4 Liability Litigation, 460 F.3d 1217, 1228 (9th Cir. 2006) (citation omitted).

5 Finally, the Court's warning to a party that failure to obey the court's order will result in  
6 dismissal satisfies the “considerations of the alternatives” requirement. Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262;  
7 Malone, 833 at 132–33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court’s June 12, 2023 order expressly  
8 warned Plaintiff that his failure to comply with the Court’s order would result in a  
9 recommendation to dismiss the action. (ECF No. 6.) Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that  
10 dismissal could result from his noncompliance.

11 Additionally, at this stage in the proceedings there is little available to the Court that would  
12 constitute a satisfactory lesser sanction while protecting the Court from further unnecessary  
13 expenditure of its scarce resources. Plaintiff has not paid the filing fee, and will likely attempt to  
14 proceed in forma pauperis in this action, apparently making monetary sanctions of little use, and  
15 the preclusion of evidence or witnesses is likely to have no effect given that Plaintiff has ceased  
16 litigating his case.

#### 17 IV.

#### 18 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

19 Based on the foregoing, the Court HEREBY ORDERS the Clerk of the Court to randomly  
20 assign a district judge to this action.

21 Further, the Court finds that dismissal is the appropriate sanction and HEREBY  
22 RECOMMENDS that this action be dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to obey a Court  
23 order, failure to pay the filing fee, and failure to prosecute this action.

24 These Findings and Recommendation will be submitted to the United States District Judge  
25 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within **fourteen (14)**  
26 days after being served with these Findings and Recommendation, Plaintiff may file written  
27 objections with the Court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge's  
28 Findings and Recommendation.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the

1 specified time may result in the waiver of the “right to challenge the magistrate’s factual  
2 findings” on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing Baxter v.  
3 Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

4  
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: July 6, 2023



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28