

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION

Kendrick L. Brown v. Unknown Wilson

Brown v. Unknown Wilson · No. 1:25-cv-127-ACL · Decided February 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri dismissed Kendrick L. Brown’s civil rights action against an unidentified Butler County police officer without prejudice. The dismissal was based on Plaintiff’s failure to comply with an order directing him to file an amended complaint and his failure to prosecute, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Southeastern Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Southeastern Division
DECIDED	February 11, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-127-ACL
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court sua sponte dismissed the civil-rights action without prejudice after Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint as ordered and failed to prosecute the case.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court memorandum and order; nonprecedential.
PARTIES	Kendrick L. Brown v. Unknown Wilson

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- section 1983
- pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the district court could dismiss the action sua sponte and without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for Plaintiff’s failure to comply with a court order and failure to prosecute.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may dismiss an action sua sponte and without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) when the plaintiff fails to comply with a court order and fails to prosecute after receiving meaningful notice, a clear warning of dismissal, and adequate time to comply.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“by the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Kendrick L. Brown alleged that a Butler County police officer violated his civil rights. The district court determined that his complaint was defective and directed him to file an amended complaint. Despite receiving notice of the required action, a specific deadline, and a warning that noncompliance would result in dismissal, Brown did not respond or seek an extension.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff commenced the action on August 5, 2025, alleging civil-rights violations by a Butler County police officer. The court granted leave to proceed without prepaying fees or costs, found the complaint defective, and ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint by January 5, 2026, warning that failure to comply would result in dismissal. Plaintiff neither responded nor requested additional time, so the court dismissed the action without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962)
- Brown v. Frey, 806 F.2d 801, 803 (8th Cir. 1986)

OPINION

Kendrick L. Brown v. Unknown Wilson
PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION
KENDRICK L. BROWN,)
) Plaintiff,)) v.) No. 1:25-cv-127-ACL)
UNKNOWN WILSON,)
) Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon review of the file. Plaintiff Kendrick L. Brown commenced this civil action on August 5, 2025, alleging violations of his civil rights by a Butler County police officer. ECF No. 1. On December 5, 2025, the Court granted Plaintiff's Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs, and further found Plaintiff's complaint was defective and directed him to file an amended complaint. ECF No. 5. The Court cautioned Plaintiff that his failure to timely comply with the Order would result in the dismissal of the case without further notice. *Id.* Plaintiff's response was due by January 5, 2026. To date, Plaintiff has neither responded to the Court's Order, nor sought additional time to do so. Plaintiff was given meaningful notice of what was expected, he was cautioned that his case would be dismissed if he failed to timely comply, and he was given ample time to comply. The Court will therefore dismiss this action, without prejudice, due to Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's December 5, 2025 Order and his failure to prosecute his case. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); see also *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962) (the authority of a court to dismiss sua sponte for lack of prosecution is inherent power governed "by the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases"); *Brown v. Frey*, 806 F.2d 801, 803 (8th Cir. 1986) (a district court has the power to dismiss an action for the plaintiffs failure to comply with any court order). Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED without prejudice. IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED that an appeal from this dismissal would not be taken in good faith. An Order of Dismissal will accompany this Memorandum and Order. Dated this 11th day of February, 2026. NE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE