

1  
2  
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 \* \* \*

6 TYRONE NOEL NUNN,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01239-GMN-EJY

DISMISSAL ORDER

11  
12 Plaintiff Tyrone Nunn (“Plaintiff”) brings this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C.  
13 § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while incarcerated  
14 at High Desert State Prison. (ECF No. 6 at 1.) On January 23, 2025, this Court ordered  
15 Plaintiff to file an amended complaint by February 23, 2025. (ECF No. 5 at 7.) The Court  
16 warned Plaintiff that the action could be dismissed if he failed to file an amended  
17 complaint by that deadline. (*Id.*) That deadline expired and Plaintiff did not file an  
18 amended complaint, move for an extension, or otherwise respond.

19 **I. DISCUSSION**

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

1 dismiss an action on one of these grounds, the Court must consider: (1) the public's  
2 interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the Court's need to manage its docket;  
3 (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of  
4 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. See *In re*  
5 *Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting  
6 *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130).

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

14 The fifth factor requires the Court to consider whether less drastic alternatives can  
15 be used to correct the party's failure that brought about the Court's need to consider  
16 dismissal. See *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining  
17 that considering less drastic alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order  
18 does not satisfy this factor); accord *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th  
19 Cir. 2002) (explaining that “the persuasive force of” earlier Ninth Circuit cases that  
20 “implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic alternatives prior to disobedience of the court's  
21 order as satisfying this element[,]” *i.e.*, like the “initial granting of leave to amend coupled  
22 with the warning of dismissal for failure to comply[,]” have been “eroded” by *Yourish*).  
23 Courts “need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before finally dismissing a  
24 case, but must explore possible and meaningful alternatives.” *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779  
25 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed until and  
26 unless Plaintiff files an amended complaint, the only alternative is to enter a second order  
27 setting another deadline. But the reality of repeating an ignored order is that it often only  
28

1 delays the inevitable and squanders the Court's finite resources. The circumstances here  
2 do not indicate that this case will be an exception: there is no hint that Plaintiff needs  
3 additional time or evidence that he did not receive the Court's screening order. Setting  
4 another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth  
5 factor favors dismissal.

6 **II. CONCLUSION**

7 Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, the Court finds that they  
8 weigh in favor of dismissal. It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without  
9 prejudice based on Plaintiff's failure to file an amended complaint in compliance with this  
10 Court's January 23, 2025, order and for failure to state a claim. The Clerk of Court is  
11 kindly directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case. No other documents  
12 may be filed in this now-closed case. If Plaintiff wishes to pursue his claims, he must file  
13 a complaint in a new case.

14 It is further ordered that the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 4)  
15 is granted. Plaintiff shall not be required to pay an initial installment of the filing fee. Even  
16 though this action is dismissed, and is otherwise unsuccessful, the full filing fee will still  
17 be due, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///


26 ///

27 ///

28

1 It is further ordered that, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915, the NDOC will forward payments  
2 from the account of **Tyrone Nunn, 1252474** to the Clerk of the United States District  
3 Court, District of Nevada, 20% of the preceding month's deposits (in months that the  
4 account exceeds \$10.00) until the full \$350 filing fee has been paid for this action. The  
5 Clerk of the Court will send a copy of this order to the Finance Division of the Clerk's  
6 Office. The Clerk will send a copy of this order to the attention of **Chief of Inmate**  
7 **Services for the Nevada Department of Corrections** at [formapauperis@doc.nv.gov](mailto:formapauperis@doc.nv.gov)

8 March 4, 2025

9  
10   
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 Gloria M. Navarro, Judge  
13 United States District Court  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28