

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3  
4 NATHAN WILLIAMS,  
5 Plaintiff

2:17-cv-01119-JAD-VCF

6 v.

**Order**

7 SGT. ALLEN et al.,  
8 Defendants

9  
10 This is a *pro se* civil rights action filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a state prisoner. On  
11 April 25, 2017, I denied plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* without prejudice  
12 because the application was incomplete.<sup>1</sup> I ordered plaintiff to file a fully complete application to  
13 proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full \$400 filing fee within 30 days from the date of that  
14 order.<sup>2</sup> The 30-day period has now expired, and plaintiff has not filed another application to  
15 proceed *in forma pauperis*, paid the full filing fee, or otherwise responded to the court's order.

16 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of  
17 that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.<sup>3</sup> A  
18 court may dismiss an action with prejudice based on a party's failure to prosecute an action,  
19 failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.<sup>4</sup> In determining whether to

20  
21 <sup>1</sup> ECF No. 3 at 1–2.

22 <sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 2.

23 <sup>3</sup> *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

24 <sup>4</sup> See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with  
25 local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to  
26 comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–  
27 41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to  
28 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 order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424  
(9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

1 dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with  
2 local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public’s interest in expeditious  
3 resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the  
4 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the  
5 availability of less drastic alternatives.<sup>5</sup>

6 In the instant case, the first two factors—the public’s interest in expeditiously resolving  
7 this litigation and the court’s interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissal. The  
8 third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal, since a  
9 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading  
10 ordered by the court or prosecuting an action.<sup>6</sup> The fourth factor—the public policy favoring  
11 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors that favor dismissal.  
12 Finally, a court’s warning to a party that his failure to obey the court’s order will result in  
13 dismissal satisfies the “consideration of alternatives” requirement.<sup>7</sup> My order giving the plaintiff  
14 30 days to file another application or pay the full filing fee expressly stated: “IT IS FURTHER  
15 ORDERED that if [p]laintiff does not timely comply with this order, dismissal of this action may  
16 result.”<sup>8</sup> Thus, plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would result from his  
17 noncompliance with the court’s order.

18 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **this action is DISMISSED** without prejudice based  
19 on plaintiff’s failure to file another application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing  
20 . . .

---

24 <sup>5</sup> *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130; *Ferdik*,  
25 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.


26 <sup>6</sup> See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

27 <sup>7</sup> *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

28 <sup>8</sup> ECF No. 3 at 2.

1 fee in compliance with the April 25, 2017, order. The Clerk of Court is instructed to **CLOSE**  
2 **THIS CASE.**

3 DATED: June 2, 2017

4  
5   
6 \_\_\_\_\_  
7 Jennifer A. Dorsey  
8 United States District Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28