

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Brick P. Houston,
Plaintiff,

v.

State of Nevada, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No.: 2:18-cv-01115-JAD-EJY

Order Dismissing Action

Plaintiff Brick P. Houston brings this civil-rights case under § 1983 for events he alleges occurred during his incarceration at High Desert State Prison.¹ On August 23, 2019, after court mail sent to Houston was returned,² the magistrate judge ordered Houston to update his address with the court within 30 days.³ The magistrate judge expressly warned Houston that his failure to timely comply with the order would result in the dismissal of this case.⁴ The deadline has passed, mail to Houston continues to be returned, and Houston has not filed an updated address.

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.⁵ 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.⁶ In determining whether to

¹ ECF No. 1-1 (complaint).

² ECF No. 6.

³ ECF No. 7 (order).

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

⁶ *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

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.⁷

6 I find that the first two factors—the public's interest in expeditiously resolving the
7 litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this case.
8 The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury
9 arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or
10 prosecuting an action.⁸ The fourth factor is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
11 dismissal, and a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in
12 dismissal satisfies the consideration-of-alternatives requirement.⁹ Houston was warned that his
13 case would be dismissed without prejudice if he failed to update his address within 30 days.¹⁰
14 So, Houston had adequate warning that his failure to update his address would result in this
15 case's dismissal.

19 keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir.
20 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).

21 ⁷ *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;
22 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

23 ⁸ See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

⁹ *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

¹⁰ ECF No. 7 (order).

