

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

Jessica Carline v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc.

Carline · No. 3:24-cv-00656 · Decided January 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana dismissed Jessica Carline’s action against Samsung Electronics America, Inc. without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). The court found that Carline failed to appear at a telephone conference and a subsequent show-cause hearing, despite receiving court orders and notice that noncompliance could result in dismissal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Shelly D. Dick
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana
DECIDED	January 13, 2026
DOCKET	3:24-cv-00656
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court sua sponte dismissed the action without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) after the self-represented plaintiff failed to attend a court-ordered status conference and a subsequent show-cause hearing.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure case management failure to prosecute

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court may dismiss an action on its own motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) when the plaintiff fails to prosecute and fails to comply with court orders.
2. Whether Plaintiff's repeated failures to attend court proceedings and comply with court orders warranted dismissal without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may dismiss an action on its own motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), with or without notice to the parties, when the plaintiff fails to prosecute or comply with court orders.
2. Dismissal without prejudice was warranted because Plaintiff failed to attend a court-ordered telephone conference, failed to comply with a show-cause order, and failed to attend the show-cause hearing despite notice and warnings that dismissal could result.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A district court may dismiss a case on its own motion under Rule 41(b) with or without notice to the parties."

"IT IS ORDERED that the above-captioned lawsuit be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for the failure of Plaintiff Jessica Carline to comply with Court orders and failure to prosecute this case."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Following the withdrawal of Plaintiff's former attorney, the court ordered Plaintiff to attend a December 2, 2025 telephone conference concerning the status of the case. Plaintiff did not appear, did not contact the court, and did not respond to a subsequent order requiring her to appear and show cause why the case should not be dismissed. Plaintiff also failed to appear at the January 8, 2026 show-cause hearing despite notice by regular and certified mail.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

After Plaintiff's former counsel withdrew, the court gave Plaintiff time to obtain new counsel and ordered her to attend a telephone status conference. Plaintiff failed to attend that conference, failed to respond to an order requiring her to appear and show cause, and failed to attend the show-cause hearing. The court dismissed the case without prejudice for failure to comply with court orders and failure to prosecute.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co. Ltd., 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5th Cir. 1985)
- Link v. Wabash Railroad Co., 370 U.S. 626, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 8 L. Ed. 2d 734 (1962)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA JESSICA CARLINE CIVIL ACTION NO. VERSUS 24-656-SDD-EWD SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC. ORDER AND JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL Plaintiff Jessica Carline, who is representing herself, has failed to prosecute her case and to follow Court orders.

Therefore, this case will be dismissed without prejudice on the Court's own motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). On October 23, 2025, this Court set a December 2, 2025 telephone conference to discuss the status of this matter following the withdrawal of Carline's former lawyer,¹ as Carline was given time to find a new lawyer. Carline was ordered to attend the telephone conference.² Although the telephone conference was held open for twenty (20) minutes, Carline did not appear, nor did she contact the Court to say that she could not appear.³ Carline was then ordered to appear and show cause on January 8, 2026 why her claims in this case should not be dismissed for her failure to appear for the telephone conference as ordered.⁴ Carline was specifically told by the Court that her case could be dismissed without further notice if she did not appear as ordered for the January 8, 2026 show cause ¹ Carline initially failed to appear for the hearing on her counsel's motion to withdraw, as ordered, but she eventually participated after she was contacted by chambers staff.

R. Doc. 41. Documents filed in the record of this case are referred to as "R. Doc. ____". ² R. Docs. 41-42. The Court sent notice of the conference to Carline by regular and certified mail. The Court's certified mailing to Carline, directed to her address of record, was delivered. See R. Doc. 44. Carline was also told during the October 23, 2025 hearing that the telephone conference was scheduled for December 2nd.

³ R. Doc. 45. While the telephone conference was open, the courtroom deputy called Carline on her telephone number listed in the record, but Carline did not answer or return the voicemail left for her. ⁴ R. Doc. 46. hearing.⁵ The Court sent notice of the show cause hearing to Carline by regular and certified mail.⁶ The Court's certified mailing to Carline, directed to her address of record, was delivered.⁷ On January 8, 2026, the show cause hearing was held.

The hearing remained open for fifteen minutes; however, Carline did not appear for the hearing or request that the hearing be rescheduled.⁸ The history of this case shows that Carline has failed to take appropriate action to prosecute her claims. Carline has failed to respond to at least two Court orders, even though she was told that her case could be dismissed.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) provides for dismissal of a suit under these facts: (b) Involuntary Dismissal; Effect. If the plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with these rules or a court order, a defendant may move to dismiss the action or any claim against it. Unless the dismissal order states otherwise, a dismissal under this subdivision (b)...operates as an adjudication on the merits.

A district court may dismiss a case on its own motion under Rule 41(b) with or without notice to the parties.⁹ Carline has ignored Court orders, even though she was told that her claims might be dismissed if she did not comply.

Accordingly, 5 R. Doc. 46, p. 2. 6 R. Docs. 46-47. 7 R. Doc. 48. 8 R. Doc. 49. 9 Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co. Ltd., 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5th Cir. 1985) (“Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) authorizes the district court to dismiss a claim for failure of prosecution.

Although the rule speaks of dismissal pursuant to a motion by the defendant a district court may dismiss on its own motion, with or without notice to the parties. This authority flows from the court’s inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases.”) (citing *Link v. Wabash Railroad Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 82 S.Ct.

1386, 8 L.Ed.2d 734 (1962)). IT IS ORDERED that the above-captioned lawsuit be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for the failure of Plaintiff Jessica Carline to comply with Court orders and failure to prosecute this case. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall send a copy of this Order and Judgment of Dismissal to Plaintiff Jessica Carline by regular mail and by certified mail, return receipt requested, to her address of record on PACER.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana on the 13th day of January, 2026. S _____
SHELLY D. DICK CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA