

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

JASEN LYNN DUSHANE,

Case No. 3:15-cv-00501-MMD-WGC

## ORDER

v.

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS et al.,

## Defendants.

14 This action is a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by  
15 a state prisoner. On August 31, 2016, the Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file  
16 an updated address with the Court within thirty (30) days. (ECF No. 13 at 2). The thirty-  
17 day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed an updated address with the  
18 Court or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

19 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the  
20 exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . .  
21 dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829,  
22 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s  
23 failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with  
24 local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for  
25 noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir.  
26 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint);  
27 *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply  
28 with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v.*

1        *U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply  
2 with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal  
3 for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

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

11        In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in  
12 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket,  
13 weigh in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs  
14 in favor of dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of  
15 unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action.  
16 See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor — public  
17 policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits — is greatly outweighed by the  
18 factors in favor of dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that  
19 his failure to obey the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of  
20 alternatives" requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33;  
21 *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file an updated  
22 address with the Court within thirty (30) days expressly stated: "It is further ordered that,  
23 if Plaintiff fails to timely comply with this order, the Court will dismiss this case without  
24 prejudice." (ECF No. 13 at 2.) Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would  
25 result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file an updated address within  
26 thirty (30) days.

27        ///

28        ///

1        It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on  
2 Plaintiff's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's August 31,  
3 2016, order.

4        It is further ordered that the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 1) is  
5 denied as moot.

6        It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court enter judgment accordingly.

7        DATED THIS 12<sup>th</sup> day of October 2016.

8  
9  
10        
11      MIRANDA M. DU  
12      UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28