



1 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam). A warning that the action may be dismissed as an appropriate  
2 sanction is considered a less drastic alternative sufficient to satisfy the last factor. See Malone,  
3 833 F.2d at 132-33 & n.1. The sanction of dismissal for lack of prosecution is appropriate where  
4 there has been unreasonable delay. See Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir.  
5 1986). Dismissal has also been held to be an appropriate sanction for failure to inform the district  
6 court and parties of a change of address pursuant to local rules. See Carey v. King, 856 F.2d  
7 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (per curiam).

8 Having considered these factors, and in light of Plaintiff's failure to submit a  
9 notice of change of address, the Court finds that dismissal of this action is appropriate.

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

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

18  
19 Dated: July 23, 2021



20 DENNIS M. COTA  
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28