

1 that order could result in the undersigned recommending that this matter be dismissed. (Id. at 2.)
2 Nonetheless, the time provided plaintiff has expired and plaintiff has not responded to the order to
3 show cause in any way.

4 ANALYSIS

5 The factors to be weighed in determining whether to dismiss a case for lack of prosecution
6 are as follows: (1) the public interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need
7 to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendant; (4) the public policy favoring
8 disposition on the merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions. Hernandez v. City of
9 El Monte, 138 F.3d 393, 398 (9th Cir. 1998); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir.
10 1992); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 (9th Cir. 1988). Dismissal is a harsh penalty that
11 should be imposed only in extreme circumstances. Hernandez, 138 F.3d at 398; Ferdik, 963 F.2d
12 at 1260.

13 Failure of a party to comply with the any order of the court “may be grounds for
14 imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the
15 inherent power of the Court.” Local Rule 110. Any individual representing himself or herself
16 without an attorney is nonetheless bound by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local
17 Rules, and all applicable law. Local Rule 183(a). A party's failure to comply with applicable
18 rules and law may be grounds for dismissal or any other sanction appropriate under the Local
19 Rules. Id.

20 Here, plaintiff failed to attend the June 9, 2017 Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference.
21 The undersigned issued an order to show cause that provided plaintiff with an opportunity to
22 show good cause for plaintiff's conduct and ordered plaintiff to file an updated status report.
23 Plaintiff failed to respond to that order in any way. The order to show cause specifically warned
24 plaintiff that the failure to file a written response to that order could result in a recommendation
25 that this matter be dismissed.

26 Plaintiff's lack of prosecution of this case renders the imposition of monetary sanctions
27 futile. Moreover, the public interest in expeditious resolution of litigation, the court's need to
28 manage its docket, and the risk of prejudice to the defendant all support the imposition of the

1 sanction of dismissal. Only the public policy favoring disposition on the merits counsels against
2 dismissal. However, plaintiff's failure to prosecute the action in any way makes disposition on
3 the merits an impossibility. The undersigned will therefore recommend that this action be
4 dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to prosecute as well as plaintiff's failure to comply with the
5 court's orders. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).


6 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the July 28, 2017 Status (Pretrial
7 Scheduling) Conference is vacated.

8 Also, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

- 9 1) Plaintiff's November 16, 2016 complaint (ECF No. 1) be dismissed without prejudice;
10 and
11 2) This action be closed.

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

20 Dated: July 24, 2017

21
22
23 
24 DEBORAH BARNES
25 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

26 DLB:6
27 DB\orders\orders.pro se\ruiz2716.dlop.f&rs
28