

(1) whether the party's failure is due to willfulness, bad faith, or fault; (2) whether the adversary was prejudiced by the dismissed party's conduct; (3) whether the dismissed party was warned that failure to cooperate could lead to dismissal; and (4) whether less drastic sanctions were imposed or considered before dismissal was ordered.

Wu v. T.W. Wang, Inc., 420 F.3d 641, 643 (6th Cir. 2005); *see Reg'l Refuse Sys., Inc. v. Inland Reclamation Co.*, 842 F.2d 150, 155 (6th Cir. 1988).

As to the first factor, the Court finds that Plaintiff's failure to respond to or comply with the Court's previous order is due to Plaintiff's willfulness and/or fault. The Court's order was returned to the Court as undeliverable due to Plaintiff's failure to keep his address updated [*See Doc. 7*].

As to the second factor, the Court finds that Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's order has not prejudiced Defendants.

As to the third factor, the Court attempted to warn Plaintiff that the Court would dismiss this case if he failed to comply with the Court's order [*Doc. 6*]. Plaintiff has filed several actions in this Court and is familiar with the Court's requirements that he keep his address updated and comply with the Court's orders. *See Adkins v. Burnette*, No. 1:16-CV-42-PLR-SKL; *Adkins v. Harville*, No. 3:17-CV-409-JRG-CCS, and *Adkins v. Carter*, No. 4:18-CV-7-TWP-SKL.

Finally, as to the fourth factor, the Court finds that alternative sanctions would not be effective. Plaintiff is a pro se prisoner who has not pursued this case since filing the initial complaint.

For the reasons set forth above, the Court concludes that the relevant factors weigh in favor of dismissal of Plaintiff's action pursuant to Rule 41(b).

The Court **CERTIFIES** that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith.

AN APPROPRIATE ORDER WILL ENTER.

SO ORDERED:

s/Clifton L. Corker
United States District Judge