

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

4 Donnail A. Patterson,

5 Plaintiff

6 v.

7 State of Nevada,

8 Defendant

Case No. 2:24-cv-02332-CDS-MDC

Dismissal Order

9
10 Pro se plaintiff Donnail A. Patterson attempted to initiate this civil action but failed to
11 satisfy the matter of the filing fee and submit a complaint. On December 20, 2024, this court
12 ordered Patterson to submit a complaint and file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma*
13 *pauperis* or pay the full \$405 filing fee on or before January 17, 2025. ECF No. 3. The court warned
14 Patterson that the action could be dismissed if he failed to submit a complaint and file a fully
15 complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis* with all three documents or pay the full \$405
16 filing fee for a civil action by that deadline. *Id.* at 2. That deadline expired and Patterson did not
17 file a complaint, a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, pay the full \$405 filing
18 fee, or otherwise respond.

19 I. Discussion

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

1 expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of
2 prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and
3 (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. See *In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d
4 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130).

5 The first two factors, the public’s interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and
6 the court’s interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of Patterson’s claims. The
7 third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a
8 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading
9 ordered by the court or 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 merits—is
11 greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

12 The fifth factor requires me to consider whether less drastic alternatives can be used to
13 correct the party’s failure that brought about the need to consider dismissal. See *Yourish v. Cal.*
14 *Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less drastic alternatives
15 before the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor); accord *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*,
16 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002). Courts “need not exhaust every sanction short of
17 dismissal before finally dismissing a case, but must explore possible and meaningful alternatives.”
18 *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this court cannot operate without
19 collecting reasonable fees, and litigation cannot progress without a plaintiff’s compliance with
20 court orders, the only alternative is to enter a second order setting another deadline. But issuing a
21 second order will only delay the inevitable and further squander the court’s finite resources.
22 Setting another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these circumstances. So the fifth
23 factor favors dismissal. Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, I find that they
24 weigh in favor of dismissal.

1 **II. Conclusion**

2 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on
3 Patterson's failure to submit a complaint and file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma*
4 *pauperis* or pay the full \$405 filing fee in compliance with this court's December 20, 2024, order.

5 The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case. No
6 other documents may be filed in this now-closed case. If Patterson wishes to pursue his claims, he
7 must file a complaint in a new case and either pay the required filing fee or properly apply for *in*
8 *forma pauperis* status.

9 Dated: January 28, 2025

10 
11 _____
12 Cristina D. Silva
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28