

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

---

ALICIA SHAKIA EATON, E.D., and S.J.,

Civil No. 09-3405 (JNE/AJB)

Plaintiffs,

v.

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

MINNESOTA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S  
OFFICE, HENNEPIN COUNTY  
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, HENNEPIN  
COUNTY CONCILIATION COURT,  
NANCY ADAMS, HENNEPIN COUNTY  
DISTRICT COURT, JOHN Q. McSHANE,  
and NATIVIDAD ACEVEDO,

Defendants.

---

Plaintiff commenced this action on November 30, 2009, by filing a self-styled complaint, and an application seeking leave to proceed in forma pauperis, ("IFP"). (Docket Nos. 1 and 2.) The Court previously examined Plaintiff's submissions, and determined that her complaint was gravely deficient. Therefore, in an order dated December 21, 2009, (Docket No. 6), the Court informed Plaintiff that her IFP Application would "not be granted at this time." That order gave Plaintiff an opportunity to file an amended complaint, and expressly advised her that if she did not file a new pleading within 30 days, (i.e., by no later than January 20, 2010), the Court would recommend that this action be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

The deadline for filing an amended complaint has now expired. To date, however, Plaintiff has not complied with the Court's prior order, nor has she offered any excuse for her failure to do so. Indeed, Plaintiff has not communicated with the Court at all since she

filed her complaint. Therefore, the Court will now recommend, in accordance with the prior order, that this action be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). See Henderson v. Renaissance Grand Hotel, 267 Fed.Appx. 496, 497 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008) (unpublished opinion) (“[a] district court has discretion to dismiss an action under Rule 41(b) for a plaintiff's failure to prosecute, or to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or any court order”); see also Link v. Wabash Railroad Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962) (recognizing that a federal court has the inherent authority to “manage [its] own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases”).

Based upon the above, and upon all the records and proceedings herein,

IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

1. Plaintiff's Application To Proceed In Forma Pauperis, (Docket No. 2), be **DENIED**;

and

2. This action be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

Dated: February 8, 2010

s/ Arthur J. Boylan  
ARTHUR J. BOYLAN  
United States Magistrate Judge

Pursuant to Local Rule 72.2(b), any party may object to this Report and Recommendation by filing with the Clerk of Court, and by serving upon all parties, written objections which specifically identify the portions of the Report to which objections are made and the bases for each objection. This Report and Recommendation does not constitute an order or judgment from the District Court and it is therefore not directly appealable to the Circuit Court of Appeals. Written objections must be filed with the Court before February 22, 2010.