Ross v. Wilson et al Doc. 13

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY AT OWENSBORO

BRANDON L. ROSS PLAINTIFF

v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:16-CV-P72-JHM

RITA WILSON et al. DEFENDANTS

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Upon filing the instant action, Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, assumed the responsibility to keep this Court advised of his current address and to actively litigate his claims. See Local Rule 5.2(e) ("All pro se litigants must provide written notice of a change of residential address, and, if different, mailing address, to the Clerk and to the opposing party or the opposing party's counsel. Failure to notify the Clerk of an address change may result in the dismissal of the litigant's case or other appropriate sanctions.").

Plaintiff filed this action on June 13, 2016. On July 1, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (DN 9). The Court granted this motion by Order entered on July 8, 2016 (DN 11) and mailed this Order to Plaintiff. However, on August 8, 2016, the United States Postal Service returned the notice to the Court with the returned envelope marked "RETURN TO SENDER . . . UNABLE TO FORWARD" (DN 12). Several months have passed without Plaintiff providing any notice of an address change.

Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure authorizes the involuntary dismissal of an action if a plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with an order of the court. See Jourdan v. Jabe, 951 F.2d 108, 109 (6th Cir. 1991) ("Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) recognizes the power of the district court to enter a sua sponte order of dismissal."). "Further, the United States Supreme

Court has recognized that courts have an inherent power to manage their own affairs and may dismiss a case sua sponte for lack of prosecution." Lyons-Bey v. Pennell, 93 F. App'x 732, 733 (6th Cir. 2004) (citing Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962)).

Because Plaintiff has failed to file a notice of change of address, the Court concludes that he has abandoned any interest in prosecuting this case, and the Court will dismiss the action by separate Order.

Date: October 11, 2016

Joseph H. McKinley, Jr., Chief Judge **United States District Court**

cc:

Plaintiff, pro se

Defendants

4414.011