



The Court finds that Plaintiff's failure to timely comply with the Court's previous Order is due to his own willfulness or fault. Specifically, it appears that Plaintiff received the Court's Order but chose not to comply or otherwise communicate with the Court, despite the Court's warning that failure to comply would result in the dismissal of this action [Doc. 5 p. 1]. Plaintiff's failure has not prejudiced Defendants, as they have not yet been served. The Court finds that alternative sanctions are not warranted, as Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's clear instructions. On balance, the Court finds that these factors support dismissal of this action under Rule 41(b).

The Court also notes that, "while *pro se* litigants may be entitled to some latitude when dealing with sophisticated legal issues, acknowledging their lack of formal training, there is no cause for extending this margin to straightforward procedural requirements that a layperson can comprehend as easily as a lawyer." *Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F.2d 108, 109 (6th Cir. 1991). Nothing about Plaintiff's *pro se* status prevented him from complying with the Court's Order, and Plaintiff's *pro se* status does not mitigate the balancing of factors under Rule 41(b).

Accordingly, this action will be **DISMISSED** for want of prosecution pursuant to Rule 41(b). The Court **CERTIFIES** that any appeal from this action would not be taken in good faith and would be totally frivolous. Fed. R. App. P. 24.

**AN APPROPRIATE JUDGMENT ORDER WILL ENTER.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

ENTER:

s/ Leon Jordan  
United States District Judge