

returned as undeliverable. (Doc. 19).

As it is clear that the plaintiff has failed to comply with the court order to notify the court of his current address, as is evidenced by the fact that his mail has been returned as undeliverable on several occasions, the undersigned finds a willful failure on the part of the plaintiff to comply with the order of the court. Upon consideration of the alternatives that are available to the Court, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the undersigned that this action be **DISMISSED** without prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as no lesser sanction will suffice. *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 8 L.Ed.2d 734 (1962) (interpreting Rule 41(b) not to restrict the court's inherent authority to dismiss *sua sponte* an action for lack of prosecution); *World Thrust Films, Inc. v. International Family Entertainment, Inc.*, 41 F.3d 1454, 1456-57 (11th Cir.1995); *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-op*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir.1989); *Goforth v. Owens*, 766 F.2d 1533, 1535 (11th Cir.1985); *Jones v. Graham*, 709 F.2d 1457, 1458 (11th Cir.1983).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the parties may file written objections to this recommendation with the Honorable Hugh Lawson, United States District Judge, WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS of the date of this order.

SO RECOMMENDED, this 3rd day of November, 2010.

S// Thomas Q. Langstaff
THOMAS Q. LANGSTAFF
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

msd