

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  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTOINE DESHAWN BARNES,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
J. BRUNNER, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2: 18-cv-2449 JAM KJN P

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff is a state prisoner, proceeding without counsel, with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On May 10, 2019, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on the grounds that plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies. On October 3, 2018, the court advised plaintiff of the requirements for opposing a motion for summary judgment based on plaintiff's failure to exhaust administrative remedies pursuant to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952, 957 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc), and Klinge v. Eikenberry, 849 F.2d 409, 411-12 (9th Cir. 1988).

On August 1, 2019, plaintiff was ordered to file an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to the pending motion within thirty days. In that same order, plaintiff was advised of the requirements for filing an opposition to the pending motion and that failure to oppose such a motion would be deemed as consent to have the: (a) pending motion granted; (b) action dismissed for lack of prosecution; and (c) action dismissed based on plaintiff's failure to comply

1 with these rules and a court order. Plaintiff was also informed that failure to file an opposition  
2 would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the  
3 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

4 The thirty days period has now expired and plaintiff has not responded to the court's  
5 order.

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

15 In determining to recommend that this action be dismissed, the court has considered the  
16 five factors set forth in Ferdik. Here, as in Ferdik, the first two factors strongly support dismissal  
17 of this action. The action has been pending for one year and has reached the stage for resolution  
18 of the issue of administrative exhaustion. Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Local Rules and  
19 the court's August 1, 2019 order suggests that he has abandoned this action and that further time  
20 spent by the court thereon will consume scarce judicial resources in addressing litigation which  
21 plaintiff demonstrates no intention to pursue.

22 Under the circumstances of this case, the third factor, prejudice to defendants from  
23 plaintiff's failure to oppose the motion, also favors dismissal. Plaintiff's failure to oppose the  
24 motion prevents defendants from addressing plaintiff's substantive opposition, and would delay  
25 resolution of this action, thereby causing defendants to incur additional time and expense.


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

1 The fourth factor, public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits, weighs  
2 against dismissal of this action as a sanction. However, for the reasons set forth supra, the first,  
3 second, third, and fifth factors strongly support dismissal. Under the circumstances of this case,  
4 those factors outweigh the general public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits. See  
5 Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1263.

6 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be  
7 dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

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

16 Dated: September 5, 2019

17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 KENDALL J. NEWMAN  
20 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

21 Barn2449.fr  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28