

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

2 1. Plaintiff's "motions" to add new discovery exhibits (Dkt. Nos. 32, 34) are
3 denied.

4 2. Plaintiff is directed not to file any similar such motions in the future,
5 unless he can find some substantive basis for such motions and a procedural basis for filing such
6 motions, as provided in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the court's Local Rules. Any
7 future motions of this sort will be summarily denied. Plaintiff is reminded that Eastern District
8 Local Rule 110 provides that "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or
9 with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions
10 authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court." Moreover, Eastern
11 District Local Rule 183(a) provides:


12 Any individual representing himself or herself without an attorney is
13 bound by the Federal Rules of Civil or Criminal Procedure, these Rules,
14 and all other applicable law. All obligations placed on "counsel" by these
15 Rules apply to individuals appearing in propria persona. Failure to comply
therewith may be ground for dismissal . . . or any other sanction
appropriate under these Rules.

16 See also King v. Atiyeh, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987) ("Pro se litigants must follow the
17 same rules of procedure that govern other litigants."). Case law is in accord that a district court
18 may impose sanctions, including involuntary dismissal of a plaintiff's case pursuant to Federal
19 Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), where that plaintiff fails to comply with the court's orders, the
20 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or the court's local rules. See Hells Canyon Preservation
21 Council v. U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005) (stating that courts may dismiss
22 an action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) *sua sponte* for a plaintiff's failure to
23 prosecute or comply with the rules of civil procedure or the court's orders); Ghazali v. Moran, 46
24 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam) ("Failure to follow a district court's local rules is a
25 proper ground for dismissal."); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992)
26 ("Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), the district court may dismiss an action for

1 failure to comply with any order of the court.”); Thompson v. Housing Auth. of City of L.A., 782
2 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986) (per curiam) (stating that district courts have inherent power to
3 control their dockets and may impose sanctions including dismissal).

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: April 8, 2011

6
7 
8 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26