1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
3	GABRIEL M. BRISTOL,)	Case No. 2:16-cv-00705-JCM-CWH
4	Plaintiff,	
5	v.)	
6	ELIZABETH JOAN HUGHES,	REPORT & RECOMMENDATION
7	Defendant.	
8)	
9	This matter is before the Court due to Plaintiff and Counter Defendant Gabriel M. Bristol's	
10	failure to comply with the Court's order (ECF No. 26) and order to show cause (ECF No. 32).	
11	I. Background	
12	On June 21, 2017, Defendant and Counter Claimant Elizabeth Joan Hughes filed a proposed	
13	discovery plan and scheduling order (ECF No. 20), in which she represented that Plaintiff was	
14	unresponsive to Defendant's attempts to draft a discovery plan. Based on these representations, the	
15	Court scheduled a hearing. Subsequently, the Court granted Plaintiff's counsel's motion to withdraw	
16	(ECF No. 22). At the hearing (ECF No. 26), Plaintiff represented that he planned to hire new	
17	counsel, and requested time to do so before filing a discovery plan. The Court ordered Plaintiff to	
18	have new counsel file a notice of appearance and submit a proposed discovery plan and scheduling	
19	order no later than July 25, 2017. To date, Plaintiff has not submitted a discovery plan, filed a notice	
20	of appearance of new counsel, or make any further filings in this matter.	
21	On August 2, 2017, this Court entered an Order to Show Cause (ECF No. 32), requiring	
22	Plaintiff to show in writing no later than August 17, 2017 why he failed to comply with the Court's	
23	previous order. To date, Plaintiff has not responded to the Order to Show Cause.	
24	II. ANALYSIS	
25	The underlying purpose of the Federal Rules	of Civil Procedure is to "secure the just, speedy,
26	and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding." Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. The rules provide	
27	several mechanisms that allow courts to accomplish this goal through the use of sanctions against	
28		
	1	

parties that fail to comply with court orders or that unnecessarily multiply proceedings. Federal Rule 1 2 of Civil Procedure 16 is the central pretrial rule that authorizes courts to manage their cases "so that 3 disposition is expedited, wasteful pretrial activities are discouraged, the quality of the trial is improved, and settlement is facilitated." In re Phenylpropanolamine Prods. Liab. Litig., 460 F.3d 4 5 1217, 1227 (9th Cir. 2006). Specifically, Rule 16(f) "puts teeth into these objectives by permitting the judge to make such orders as are just for a party's failure to obey a scheduling or pretrial order, 6 7 including dismissal." Id. Rule16(f) provides in relevant part that "[o]n motion or on its own, the court may issue any just orders, including those authorized by Rule 37(b)(2)(A)(ii)-(vii), if a party or 8 9 its attorney . . . fails to appear at a scheduling or other pretrial conference . . . or fails to obey a scheduling order or other pretrial order." Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f)(1). 10

11 Potential sanctions under Rule 37(b)(2)(A) include striking pleadings and rendering a default judgment against the disobedient party. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(A)(iii), (vi). "A court must 12 consider the following five factors before striking a pleading or declaring default: (1) the public's 13 interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk 14 15 of prejudice to the other party; (4) the public policy favoring the disposition of cases on their merits; 16 and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions." Hester v. Vision Airlines, Inc., 687 F.3d 1162, 1169 (9th Cir. 2012) (quotation omitted). Only "willfulness, bad faith, or fault of the party" justify 17 18 terminating sanctions. Id. (quotation omitted). It is within the court's discretion whether to impose discovery sanctions. Id. 19

20 Here, the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of terminating sanctions. Plaintiff has 21 22 completely disengaged from participation in this case, as demonstrated by its failure to initiate a 23 scheduling conference, draft a scheduling order, comply with the Court's orders, or to respond to the 24 Court's Order to Show Cause. Plaintiff's repeated failures to comply with the court's orders are 25 inconsistent with Rule 1's directive to "secure a just, speedy, and inexpensive" determination of this 26 action. Plaintiff's inaction have also interfered with the Court's management of its docket, 27 multiplied these proceedings, and have squandered the Court's resources.

28

The third factor and fourth factors, risk of prejudice to the other parties and the public policy 1 2 favoring disposition of cases on their merits, also weigh in favor of terminating sanctions. Plaintiff's 3 failure to comply with the court's orders have made it impossible for this case to move forward. See United States v. High Country Broad., 3 F.3d 1244, 1245 (9th Cir. 1993) (per curiam). Plaintiff's 4 5 failure to respond to the Court's orders also are prejudicial to the other parties, who are entitled to 6 conduct discovery, proceed to trial, and obtain a rightful decision in this case. 7 Finally, sanctions less drastic than terminating sanctions are unavailable because Plaintiff has 8 refused to comply with multiple orders. Given Plaintiff's failure to comply with past orders, the 9 Court has no reason to believe he would comply with future orders. 10 Given that these factors all weigh in favor of terminating sanctions, the Court will 11 recommend that Plaintiff's Complaint (ECF No. 1) be stricken as a sanction for his failure to comply 12 with the Court's orders. Defendant's Counterclaim will proceed according to the scheduling order currently in effect (ECF No. 30). 13 14 // 15 // 16 // 17 // 18 // 19 // 20 // 21 // 22 // 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 //27 // 28 3

1	RECOMMENDATION	
2	IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that Plaintiff's Complaint (ECF No. 1) be stricken, and	
3	Plaintiff's claim be dismissed with prejudice for failure to comply with the Court's order.	
4	<u>NOTICE</u>	
5	Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2, any objection to this Finding and Recommendation must be in	
6	writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen (14) days. The Supreme Court has held	
7	that the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file	
8	objections within the specified time. <i>Thomas v. Arn</i> , 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). This circuit has also	
9	held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and	
10	brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal	
11	factual issues from the order of the District Court. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir.	
12	1991); Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).	
13	DATED: August 23, 2017	
14	Curst	
15	C.W. Hoffman, Jr.	
16	United States Magistrate Judge	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	4	