

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

GRANDY SANDERS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CLARK COUNTY DETENTION  
CENTER, et. al,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-cv-00478-KJD-NJK

ORDER

This action is a *pro se* civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a person who formerly was housed at the Clark County Detention Center. On July 30, 2021, this Court issued an order denying the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* for prisoners as moot because Plaintiff was no longer incarcerated. (ECF No. 8). The Court ordered Plaintiff to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* for non-prisoners or pay the full filing fee of \$402.00 by August 30, 2021. (*Id.*) That deadline has passed, and Plaintiff has not filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* for non-prisoners, paid the full filing fee, 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

1 to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.  
 2 See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance  
 3 with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal  
 4 for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856  
 5 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring  
 6 *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833  
 7 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson*  
 8 *v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and  
 9 failure to comply with local rules).

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

17 In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in  
 18 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket,  
 19 weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs  
 20 in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of  
 21 unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See  
 22 *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor – public policy  
 23 favoring disposition of cases on their merits – is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor  
 24 of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
 25 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
 26 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d  
 27 at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file an application to proceed *in forma*  
 28 *pauperis* for non-prisoners or pay the full filing fee by August 30, 2021 expressly warned

1 Plaintiff that, if he failed to timely comply with the order, dismissal of this action may result.  
2 (ECF 8 at 2). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal could result from his  
3 noncompliance with the Court's order to file an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*  
4 for non-prisoners or pay the full filing fee by August 30, 2021.

5 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on  
6 Plaintiff's failure to file an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* for non-prisoners or  
7 pay the full filing fee in compliance with this Court's July 30, 2021 order. If Plaintiff wishes  
8 to pursue any claims, he must file a complaint in a new action with the required fee or  
9 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* for non-prisoners.

10 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly and  
11 close this case.

12 DATED THIS 7<sup>th</sup> day of September 2021.



13  
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28