

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ARCHIE A. MARTINEZ,  
Plaintiff,

No. 09-cv-0680-KJM-CMK-P

vs.

ORDER

G. HOOVER, et al.,  
Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On August 5, 2016, the court directed plaintiff to file a status report within 20 days, and defendants to file a status report within 35 days. The court required the status reports from the parties in order to determine how much additional time was needed to complete discovery and file dispositive motions. Defendants filed their status report on September 9, 2016. No status report has been received from plaintiff. In addition, defendants indicate they have not received any communication from plaintiff nor has plaintiff paid the sanctions ordered in 2012. Local Rule 110 provides for the imposition sanctions for failure to comply with the local rules and any order of the court.

The court must weigh five factors before imposing the harsh sanction of dismissal. See Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987). Those factors are: (1) the public's

1 interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its own docket; (3)  
2 the risk of prejudice to opposing parties; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on  
3 their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions. See id.; see also Ghazali v. Moran,  
4 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam). A warning that the action may be dismissed as an  
5 appropriate sanction is considered a less drastic alternative sufficient to satisfy the last factor.  
6 See Malone, 833 F.2d at 132-33 & n.1. The sanction of dismissal for lack of prosecution is  
7 appropriate where there has been unreasonable delay. See Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421,  
8 1423 (9th Cir. 1986). Dismissal has also been held to be an appropriate sanction for failure to  
9 comply with an order to file an amended complaint. See Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258,  
10 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992).

11           Having considered these factors, and in light of plaintiff's failure to file a status  
12 report as ordered, the court finds that dismissal of this action is appropriate.

13           Based on the foregoing, the undersigned recommends that this action be  
14 dismissed, without prejudice, for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and  
15 orders.

16           These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District  
17 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 14 days  
18 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written  
19 objections with the court. Responses to objections shall be filed within 14 days after service of  
20 objections. Failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal.  
21 See Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

22  
23 DATED: September 15, 2016

24   
25 **CRAIG M. KELLISON**  
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE