## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA ROANOKE DIVISION

| JAMES PORTER MARINE, JR., | )                      |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Plaintiff,                | ) Case No. 7:22CV0064  |
| v.                        | OPINION                |
| DANIEL HILL,              | ) JUDGE JAMES P. JONES |
| Defendant.                | )                      |
|                           | )                      |

James Porter Marine, Jr., Pro Se Plaintiff.

The plaintiff, James Porter Marine, Jr., proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, alleging violations of his constitutional rights. Because the cause of action occurred in this district, the Eastern District transferred the case on November 14, 2022.

This court's initial Order in the case, ECF No. 4, directed Marine to provide specific financial information. It also notified him of his responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current mailing address. The Order warned him that failure to comply with this requirement would result in dismissal of the action without prejudice. It is self-evident that the court must have a viable address by which to communicate reliably with Marine about this case. On December 28, 2022, the

Doc. 8

court's mailing of ECF No. 4 was returned as "refused" and thus undeliverable to

Marine at the address he had provided. The returned envelope indicated that

authorities were unable to forward the mailing.

Based on Marine's failure to comply with the court's Order regarding the

need to provide the court with appropriate financial information and a mailing

address that would allow reliable communication about his case, I conclude that he

is no longer interested in pursuing this civil action. Therefore, I will dismiss the

action without prejudice for failure to prosecute. See Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d

93, 96 (4th Cir. 1989) (stating pro se litigants are subject to time requirements and

respect for court orders and dismissal is an appropriate sanction for non-

compliance); Donnelly v. Johns-Manville Sales Corp., 677 F.2d 339, 340-41 (3d

Cir. 1982) (recognizing a district court may sua sponte dismiss an action pursuant

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

An appropriate Order will issue herewith.

DATED: December 29, 2022

/s/ JAMES P. JONES

Senior United States District Judge

-2-