

1 and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions. See id.; see also Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52,
2 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam). A warning that the action may be dismissed as an appropriate
3 sanction is considered a less drastic alternative sufficient to satisfy the last factor. See Malone,
4 833 F.2d at 132-33 & n.1. The sanction of dismissal for lack of prosecution is appropriate where
5 there has been unreasonable delay. See Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir.
6 1986). Dismissal has also been held to be an appropriate sanction for failure to inform the district
7 court and parties of a change of address pursuant to local rules. See Carey v. King, 856 F.2d
8 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (per curiam).

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

11 Based on the foregoing, the undersigned recommends that this action be dismissed,
12 without prejudice, for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders, and
13 that all pending motions, ECF Nos. 8 and 11, be denied as moot.

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

20
21 Dated: February 17, 2021



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