

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

RONALD SATISH EMRIT,

Plaintiff,

v.

SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL
HOUSING AUTHORITY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:16-cv-02701-MMD-VCF

ORDER

On October 30, 2017, plaintiff was directed to file an amended complaint by November 22, 2017. (ECF No. 19.) That deadline has has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

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 *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court

1 order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of
2 prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

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

10 In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in
11 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket,
12 weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendant, also weighs in
13 favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of
14 unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action.
15 *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor — public
16 policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits — is greatly outweighed by the factors
17 in favor of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure
18 to obey the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of
19 alternatives" requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33;
20 *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file an amended
21 complaint within fifteen (15) days expressly stated: "Failure to file an amended complaint
22 with thirty (30) days may result in dismissal of this action with prejudice." (Dkt. no. 6.)
23 Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would result from Plaintiff's
24 noncompliance with the Court's order to file an amended complaint.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

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 amended complaint in compliance with this Court's order.

DATED THIS 6th day of December 2017.



MIRANDA M. DU
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE