

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jana Williams v. Kristi Culver Kapetan, et al.

Williams v. Kapetan · No. 1:25-cv-01387-JLT-SKO · Decided January 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The document is a magistrate judge’s Findings and Recommendation in Jana Williams’s action against Kristi Culver Kapetan and others. It recommends dismissal because Plaintiff failed to comply with the Court’s screening order and order to show cause, and failed to prosecute the case. The recommendation was issued for review by the assigned district judge, with twenty-one days allowed for objections.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sheila K. Oberto
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 6, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01387-JLT-SKO
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Findings and recommendation by a magistrate judge that the action be dismissed for failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A district court may dismiss an action as a sanction for failure to prosecute, failure to obey court orders, or failure to comply with local rules, under its inherent docket-control authority and applicable local rules.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; findings and recommendation by a federal magistrate judge, subject to district-judge review.
PARTIES	Jana Williams v. Kristi Culver Kapetan, et al.

TOPICS

- sanctions
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed because Plaintiff failed to comply with the court's screening order.
2. Whether the action should be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

HOLDINGS

1. A court may dismiss an action when a party fails to comply with court orders or fails to prosecute, and Plaintiff's failure to comply with both the screening order and the order to show cause warranted dismissal of the action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Based on Plaintiff’s failure to comply with, or otherwise respond to, the screening order and the OSC, there is no alternative but to dismiss the action for her failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jana Williams filed this action pro se and in forma pauperis. After screening, the court determined that her complaint failed to state any cognizable claims and ordered her to amend, stand on the complaint, or voluntarily dismiss within thirty days. Williams did none of those things, did not request an extension, and failed to respond to a subsequent order to show cause warning that noncompliance could result in dismissal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on October 17, 2025, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. The court screened the complaint and found that it failed to state any cognizable claims, then gave Plaintiff thirty days to amend, stand on the complaint, or voluntarily dismiss. After Plaintiff took none of those actions, the court issued an order to show cause, to which Plaintiff also failed to respond. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal, subject to review by the assigned district judge and the parties' opportunity to object.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Thompson v. Housing Authority of L.A., 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)

