

1

2

3

4

5

6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8

* * *

9

MATTHEW J. SILVA,

Case No. 2:16-cv-00348-RFB-NJK

10

Plaintiff,

ORDER

11

v.

12

STATE OF NEVADA et al.,

13

Defendants.

14

15

This action is a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a state prisoner. On August 30, 2016, the Court issued a minute order directing Plaintiff to file written notification of his change of address on or before September 30, 2016. (ECF No. 3). The deadline has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed an updated address notification or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring

1 *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833
2 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson*
3 *v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and
4 failure to comply with local rules).

5 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey
6 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:
7 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to
8 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring
9 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.
10 *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;
11 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

12 In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in
13 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket,
14 weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs
15 in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of
16 unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See
17 *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor – public policy
18 favoring disposition of cases on their merits – is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor
19 of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey
20 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"
21 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779
22 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file an updated address notification
23 with the Court on or before September 30, 2016, expressly stated: "if no action is taken
24 in this case on or before Friday, September 30, 2016, the Court will dismiss this action
25 with prejudice for failure to comply with Minutes of the Court and LSR 2-2." (ECF No. 3).
26 Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would result from his noncompliance
27 with the Court's order to file an updated address notification.

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is dismissed with prejudice based on Plaintiff's failure to file an updated address notification in compliance with this Court's August 30, 2016 minute order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 1) is denied as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly.

DATED this 16th day of November 2016.



RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE