

1 rules. Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming grant of an
2 unopposed motion to dismiss under local rule by deeming a *pro se* litigant’s failure to
3 oppose as consent to granting the motion); United States v. Warren, 601 F.2d 471, 474
4 (9th Cir. 1979). Before dismissing an action for failure to comply with local rules, the
5 district court “weigh[s] several factors: ‘(1) the public’s interest in expeditious
6 resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of
7 prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases of their
8 merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions.’” Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53
9 (quoting Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir.1986)).

10 Here, the Court concludes that “the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of
11 litigation,” “the court’s need to manage its docket,” and “the risk of prejudice to the
12 defendants” weigh in favor of granting the motion to dismiss based on Plaintiff’s
13 failure to file an opposition. See Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53. The majority of these factors
14 weigh in favor of dismissal.

15 Because Plaintiff has failed to comply with Civil Local Rule 7.1.f.3.c, the Court
16 finds good cause to grant Defendants’ unopposed motion to dismiss. The Court’s
17 docket reflects that Plaintiff was served with a copy of the motions and the Court’s
18 briefing schedule. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants’ motion to dismiss
19 as unopposed. See Civ. Local R. 7.1.f.3.c; see also Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53.

20 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Complaint is **DISMISSED**
21 **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**, and the hearing on Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss,
22 currently set for May 26, 2017 is **VACATED**.

23 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED.

24
25 DATED: May 17, 2017

26 
27 HON. GONZALO P. CURIEL
28 United States District Judge