

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 JUSTIN ANTHONY KURPIEL,

Case No. 2:24-cv-00524-ART-NJK

4 Plaintiff,

ORDER

5 v.

6 HEATHER COOK,

7 Defendants.

8 Plaintiff Justin Kurpiel brings this civil-rights action under
9 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered
10 while incarcerated at High Desert State Prison. (ECF No. 11). On August 19,
11 2024, this Court ordered Kurpiel to file an amended complaint by September 18,
12 2024. (ECF No. 10). The Court warned Kurpiel that the action could be dismissed
13 if he failed to file an amended complaint by that deadline. (*Id.* at 9). That deadline
14 expired and Kurpiel did not file an amended complaint, move for an extension, or
15 otherwise respond.

16 **I. DISCUSSION**

17 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n
18 the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where
19 appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los*
20 *Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based
21 on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. *See Carey v.*
22 *King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to
23 comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of
24 address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)
25 (dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining whether to
26 dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the
27 public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court’s need to
28 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy

1 favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic
2 alternatives. See *In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217,
3 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130).

4 The first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this
5 litigation and the Court's interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of
6 dismissal of Kurpiel's claims. The third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants,
7 also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from the
8 occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or
9 prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir.
10 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their
11 merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

12 The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic
13 alternatives can be used to correct the party's failure that brought about the
14 Court's need to consider dismissal. See *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983,
15 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less drastic alternatives *before*
16 the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor); *accord*
17 *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002). Courts "need not
18 exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a case, but
19 must explore possible and meaningful alternatives." *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779
20 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed
21 until and unless Kurpiel files an amended complaint, the only alternative is to
22 enter a second order setting another deadline. But the reality of repeating an
23 ignored order is that it often only delays the inevitable and squanders the Court's
24 finite resources. The circumstances here do not indicate that this case will be an
25 exception. Setting another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these
26 circumstances. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

27 //


28 //

1 **II. CONCLUSION**

2 Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, the Court finds that
3 they weigh in favor of dismissal. It is therefore ordered that this action is
4 dismissed without prejudice based on Justin Kurpiel’s failure to file an amended
5 complaint in compliance with this Court’s August 19, 2024, order, and for failure
6 to state a claim for relief. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment
7 accordingly and close this case. No other documents may be filed in this now-
8 closed case. If Kurpiel wishes to pursue his claims, he must file a complaint in a
9 new case.

10 It is further ordered that the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF
11 No. 3) is denied at moot.

12
13 DATED THIS 24th day of October 2024.

14
15
16 
17 _____
18 ANNE R. TRAUM
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28