

1 complaint. ECF No. 63. Judge Leen then issued another order to show cause on October 26,
2 giving Lo until November 23 to file an amended complaint. ECF No. 65. Judge Leen's October
3 23 order again explained what information Lo should include in her amended complaint and she
4 recommended that if Lo again failed to file an amended complaint, I should dismiss the case for
5 failure to comply with a court order and for failure to prosecute her case. ECF No. 65 at 3. As of
6 this date, Lo still has not filed an amended complaint.

7 The defendants now move to dismiss, based on Lo's failure to follow the court's orders. I
8 grant the defendant's motion without prejudice. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
9 41(b), I may dismiss an action for failure to comply with any order of the court. In determining
10 whether to dismiss a case for failure to comply with a court order, I must weigh five factors: "(1)
11 the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its
12 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of
13 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives." *Thompson v. Housing*
14 *Auth.*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 479 U.S. 829 (1986); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779
15 F.2d 1421, 1423-24 (9th Cir. 1986).

16 Judge Leen ordered Lo to file an amended complaint within 21 days of the ENE
17 Conference. Lo did not do so. Judge Leen gave Lo two more opportunities to file an amended
18 complaint, but Lo again failed to comply. As of this date, no amended complaint has been filed.
19 This case is now over three years old and there is still no operative complaint. Lo has been given
20 numerous opportunities to file an amended complaint. She has been given guidance on what the
21 amended complaint must contain, as well as warnings that failure to timely amend would result in
22 dismissal. Reviewing the factors listed in *Thompson*, the public's interest in expeditious
23 resolution of litigation and the court's interest in controlling its docket strongly support dismissal.
24 The risk of prejudice to the defendants is also high as they have been forced to defend against a
25 lawsuit for over three years without an operative complaint giving them notice of the claims and
26 allegations against them. The passage of time can lead to witnesses losing their memories of
27 relevant events and evidence becoming lost. Additionally, Lo has been given numerous
28

1 opportunities to file an amended complaint. Thus, there does not appear to be a less drastic
2 alternative. I therefore grant the defendant's motion to dismiss without prejudice.

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendants ETT Gaming and Affinity Gaming's
4 motion to dismiss (**ECF No. 70**) is **GRANTED**. The clerk of court shall enter judgment
5 accordingly and close the case.

6 DATED this 10th day June, 2016.



8 ANDREW P. GORDON
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28