

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 HUGO ORTIZ,

11 Plaintiff,

No. 2:08-cv-0054-JAM-JFM (PC)

12 vs.

13 JAMES E. TILTON, et al.,

14 Defendants.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

15 \_\_\_\_\_/  
16 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to  
17 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On November 13, 2008, defendants filed a motion for judgment on the  
18 pleadings pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c). On May 30, 2008, the court advised  
19 plaintiff of the requirements for filing an opposition to a motion pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c)  
20 and that failure to oppose such a motion might be deemed a waiver of opposition to the motion.

21 On November 18, 2008, plaintiff was ordered to file an opposition or a statement  
22 of non-opposition to the pending motion within thirty days. In the same order, plaintiff was  
23 informed that failure to file an opposition would result in a recommendation that this action be  
24 dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). The thirty day period has now expired and plaintiff  
25 has not responded to the court's order.

26 /////

1           “Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), the district court may dismiss  
2 an action for failure to comply with any order of the court.” Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258,  
3 1260 (9th Cir. 1992). “In determining whether to dismiss a case for failure to comply with a  
4 court order the district court must weigh five factors including: ‘(1) the public’s interest in  
5 expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of  
6 prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits;  
7 and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.’” Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260-61 (quoting  
8 Thompson v. Housing Auth., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986)); see also Ghazali v. Moran, 46  
9 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995).

10           In determining to recommend that this action be dismissed, the court has  
11 considered the five factors set forth in Ferdik. Here, as in Ferdik, the first two factors strongly  
12 support dismissal of this action. The action has been pending for one year. Plaintiff’s failure to  
13 comply with the Local Rules and the court’s November 18, 2008 order suggests that he has  
14 abandoned this action and that further time spent by the court thereon will consume scarce  
15 judicial resources in addressing litigation which plaintiff demonstrates no intention to pursue.

16           The fifth factor also favors dismissal. The court has advised plaintiff of the  
17 requirements under the Local Rules and granted ample additional time to oppose the pending  
18 motion, all to no avail. The court finds no suitable alternative to dismissal of this action.

19           Under the circumstances of this case, the third factor, prejudice to defendants  
20 from plaintiff’s failure to oppose the motion, should be given little weight. Plaintiff’s failure to  
21 oppose the motion does not put defendants at any disadvantage in this action. See Ferdik, 963  
22 F.2d at 1262. Indeed, defendants would only be “disadvantaged” by a decision by the court to  
23 continue an action plaintiff has abandoned. The fourth factor, public policy favoring disposition  
24 of cases on their merits, weighs against dismissal of this action as a sanction. However, for the  
25 reasons set forth supra, the first, second, and fifth factors strongly support dismissal and the third  
26 factor does not mitigate against it. Under the circumstances of this case, those factors outweigh

1 the general public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits. See Ferdik, 963 F.2d at  
2 1263.

3 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be  
4 dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

5 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District  
6 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty  
7 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written  
8 objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned  
9 "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The parties are advised  
10 that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District  
11 Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

12 DATED: January 13, 2009.

13  
14   
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16 12  
17 orti0054.46fr  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26