

1

2

3

4

5

6

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 DELANO MEDINA,

}

9 Plaintiff,

}

10 v.

}

3:16-cv-00633-RCJ-WGC

11 JIM PITTS,

}

ORDER

12 Defendant.

}

13 \_\_\_\_\_)

14 This action is a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a  
15 prisoner in the custody of the Colorado Department of Corrections. On September 22, 2017,  
16 this Court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file his updated address with this Court within  
17 thirty (30) days. (ECF No. 5 at 1). The thirty-day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not  
18 filed his updated address or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

19 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of  
20 that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.

21 *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court  
22 may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure  
23 to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52,  
24 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963  
25 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring  
26 amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal  
27 for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of  
28 address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for  
failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)

1 (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

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

9       In the instant case, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in  
10 expeditiously resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh  
11 in favor of dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of  
12 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in  
13 filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542  
14 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor – public policy favoring disposition of cases  
15 on their merits – is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of dismissal discussed herein.  
16 Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in  
17 dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives" requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262;  
18 *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring  
19 Plaintiff to file his updated address with the Court within thirty (30) days expressly stated: "It  
20 is further ordered that, if Plaintiff fails to timely comply with this order, the Court shall dismiss  
21 this case without prejudice." (ECF No. 5 at 2). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that  
22 dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file his updated  
23 address within thirty (30) days.


24       It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on Plaintiff's  
25 failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's September 22, 2017, order.

26       It is further ordered that the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 1) is  
27 denied as moot.

28       ///

1 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly.  
2  
3

DATED: This 20th day of November, 2017.

4  
5   
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

United States District Judge