

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
AT PADUCAH**

ARTHUR N. PRUITT, Sr.

PLAINTIFF

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:13CV-P66-R

PHIL HAZEL et al.

DEFENDANTS


MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff Arthur N. Pruitt, Sr. initiated this civil action. Upon filing the instant action, he assumed the responsibility of keeping this Court advised of his current addresses and to actively litigate his claims. *See* LR 5.2(d) (“All pro se litigants must provide written notice of a change of 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.”).

The Court sent an Order to Plaintiff on May 22, 2013. That mailing was returned marked “Return to Sender” and “Not at this Address.” Plaintiff has not advised the Court of a change of address, and neither notices from this Court nor filings by Defendants in this action can be served on Plaintiff. In such situations, courts have an inherent power “acting on their own initiative, to clear their calendars of cases that have remained dormant because of the inaction or dilatoriness of the parties seeking relief.” *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630 (1962). Because it appears to this Court that Plaintiff has abandoned any interest in prosecution of this case, the Court will dismiss Plaintiff’s claims by separate Order.

Date: August 28, 2013

cc: Plaintiff, *pro se*
Defendants
4413.009


**Thomas B. Russell, Senior Judge
United States District Court**