IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

TRAVIS CONISH, Plaintiff,))
v .)
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, Defendant.)

No. 3:08-CV-2177-K ECF

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and an order of the District Court, this case has been referred to the United States Magistrate Judge. The findings, conclusions and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge follow:

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

On December 9, 2008, Plaintiff filed this unspecified complaint. On December 19, 2008, the Court sent Plaintiff a notice of deficiency for failing to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). On December 29, 2008, the notice of deficiency was returned to the Court as undeliverable, and unable to forward. Plaintiff has not provided the Court with any alternative address.

Discussion: Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allows a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with the federal rules or any court order. *Larson v. Scott*, 157 F.3d 1030, 1031 (5th Cir. 1998). "This authority [under Rule 41(b)] flows from the court's inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases." *Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co., Ltd.*, 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5th Cir. 1985) (citing *Link v. Wabash, R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 82 S.Ct. 1386 (1962)). Plaintiff has failed to provide the Court with a current address. Accordingly, his complaint should be dismissed for want of prosecution pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

RECOMMENDATION:

The Court recommends that the complaint be dismissed for want of prosecution pursuant

to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

Signed this 18th day of February, 2009.

PAUL D. STICKNEY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT

The United States District Clerk shall serve a copy of these findings, conclusions and recommendation on Plaintiff by mailing a copy to him by United States Mail. Pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1), any party who desires to object to these findings, conclusions and recommendation must serve and file written objections within ten days after being served with a copy. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings, conclusions or recommendation to which objections are being made. The District Court need not consider frivolous, conclusory or general objections. A party's failure to file such written objections to these proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation shall bar that party from a <u>de novo</u> determination by the District Court. <u>See Thomas v. Arn</u>, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Additionally, any failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation within ten days after being served with a copy shall bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge that are accepted by the District Court, except upon grounds of plain error. <u>Douglass v. United Servs.</u> <u>Auto. Ass'n</u>, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).