

## 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## 2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 MICHAEL A. FRIMMEL,

Case No. 3:18-cv-00144-RCJ-WGC

4 Plaintiff

ORDER

5 v.

6 ROMEO ARANAS et al.,

7 Defendants

8 This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
9 by a former state prisoner. On January 12, 2021, this Court issued an order directing  
10 Plaintiff to file his updated address with this Court on or before February 12, 2021. (ECF  
11 No. 41). The deadline has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed his updated address or  
12 otherwise responded to the Court's order.

13 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the  
14 exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . .  
15 dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831  
16 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure  
17 to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.  
18 See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for  
19 noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir.  
20 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of  
21 complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal  
22 for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of  
23 address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming  
24 dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,  
25 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with  
local rules).

26 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey  
27 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:  
28 (1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to


1 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
 2 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
 3 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at  
 4 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

5 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously  
 6 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of  
 7 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of  
 8 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay  
 9 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*  
 10 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring  
 11 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of  
 12 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
 13 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
 14 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779  
 15 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file his updated address with the  
 16 Court on or before February 12, 2021 expressly stated: "IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that,  
 17 if Plaintiff fails to timely comply with this order, this case will be subject to dismissal without  
 18 prejudice." (ECF No. 41 at 2). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that dismissal would  
 19 result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file his updated address by  
 20 February 12, 2021.

21 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on  
 22 Plaintiff's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this Court's January 12,  
 23 2021, order.

24 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court will close the case and enter judgment  
 25 accordingly.

26 DATED THIS 17th day of February 2021.

27  
 28   
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE