

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE

Meener v. One Stop Housing, LLC

Meener · No. 2:25-cv-02528-MSN-cgc · Decided January 14, 2026

SUMMARY

A magistrate judge recommends involuntary dismissal with prejudice of Musshur Meener’s complaint against One Stop Housing, LLC for failure to prosecute and failure to respond to a motion to dismiss and an order to show cause. The recommendation also advises that the motion to dismiss be denied as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Charmiane G. Claxton
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee
DECIDED	January 14, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02528-MSN-cgc
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Report and recommendation on Defendant's motion to dismiss in a removed civil action. The magistrate judge recommended involuntary dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute and denial of the motion to dismiss as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Dismissal for failure to prosecute is reviewed under the Court's inherent authority to control its docket and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), guided by whether the failure was willful, in bad faith, or the party's fault; whether the adversary was prejudiced; whether the party was warned that noncompliance could result in dismissal; and whether lesser sanctions were imposed or considered.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

sanctions

motions to dismiss

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's failure to respond to the motion to dismiss and order to show cause warranted involuntary dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and the Court's inherent authority.
2. Whether Defendant's motion to dismiss should be denied as moot after recommending dismissal of the action for failure to prosecute.

HOLDINGS

1. The magistrate judge recommended involuntary dismissal with prejudice because Plaintiff failed to prosecute the action, ignored the motion to dismiss and order to show cause, and had been warned that noncompliance could result in dismissal.
2. The motion to dismiss should be denied as moot because dismissal of the complaint was recommended on an independent failure-to-prosecute ground.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"It is recommended that the first factor is met as it is Plaintiff's fault for not prosecuting his case." (at 2)

"Accordingly, it is RECOMMENDED that the Plaintiff's Complaint be involuntarily dismissed with prejudice pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) and the Court's inherent power and that the Motion to Dismiss be DENIED AS MOOT." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff did not respond to Defendant's motion to dismiss or to the Court's subsequent order to show cause. The order warned Plaintiff that failure to respond could result in dismissal for failure to prosecute. Plaintiff had engaged in no meaningful activity after removal, while Defendant took steps to advance the case.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The complaint was removed on May 19, 2025. Defendant filed a motion to dismiss on May 27, 2025, but Plaintiff filed no response. After the Court issued an order to show cause allowing fourteen days to explain why the motion should not be granted, Plaintiff again failed to respond. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal with prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and the Court's inherent docket-control authority, with the motion to dismiss denied as moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Link v. Wabash R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 8 L. Ed. 2d 734 (1962)

- Boudwin v. Graystone Insurance Co., 756 F.2d 399 (5th Cir. 1985)
- Harris v. Callwood, 844 F.2d 1254 (6th Cir. 1988)
- Sepia Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Toledo, 462 F.2d 1315 (6th Cir. 1972) (per curiam)
- Knoll v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 176 F.3d 359, 363 (6th Cir. 1999)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE WESTERN DIVISION MUSSHUR MEENER, Plaintiff, v. No. 2:25-cv-02528-MSN-cgc ONE STOP HOUSING, LLC, Defendant. REPORT AND RECOMENDATION Before the Court, by way of Administrative Order 2013-051, is the Motion to Dismiss filed on May 27, 2025 by Defendant One Stop Housing, LLC. (D.E. # 8) Local Rule 12.1 provides that “[a] party opposing a motion to dismiss must file a response within 28 days after the motion is served.” To date, Plaintiff has not filed a response to the motion.

On September 29, 2025, an order to show cause (D.E. # 10) was entered directing Plaintiff to show cause within fourteen (14) days of entry of the order as to why the Court should not grant Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss.

To date, no response to the Order to Show Cause has been filed². Plaintiff was cautioned that a failure to respond would result in a recommendation of dismissal of the case for failure to prosecute. (D.E. # 10, PageID 107) If a plaintiff fails properly to prosecute an action, it can be dismissed either pursuant to the Court’s inherent power to control its docket, or involuntarily under Fed.R.Civ.P.

41(b). Link 1 The instant case has been referred to the United States Magistrate Judge by Administrative Order pursuant to the Federal Magistrates Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 631-639. All pretrial matters within the Magistrate Judge’s jurisdiction are referred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (A) for determination, and all other pretrial matters are referred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (B)-(C) for report and recommendation.

2 The Order to Show Cause was mailed to Plaintiff at the address listed on the complaint and at the address provided by Defendant’s counsel (D.E. # 9). Only one of the mailings was returned as unclaimed. v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 8 L.Ed.2d 734 (1962); Boudwin v. Graystone Insurance Co., 756 F.2d 399 (5th Cir.1985).

The Sixth Circuit has held that dismissal for failure to prosecute is warranted where the Court affords a plaintiff a reasonable period of time to comply with orders before the dismissal occurs, see Harris v. Callwood, 844 F.2d 1254 (6th Cir.1988); Sepia Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Toledo, 462 F.2d 1315 (6th Cir.1972) (per curiam).

In determining whether to dismiss a complaint for failure to prosecute, the Court generally looks to four factors for guidance: (1) whether the party's failure is due to willfulness, bad faith, or fault; (2) whether the adversary was prejudiced by the dismissed party's conduct; (3) whether the dismissed party was warned that failure to cooperate could lead to dismissal; and (4) whether less drastic sanctions were imposed or considered before dismissal was ordered.

Knoll v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 176 F.3d 359, 363 (6th Cir.1999). Typically, none of the factors is outcome dispositive, and dismissal is entrusted to the discretion of the Court. *Id.* It is recommended that the first factor is met as it is Plaintiff's fault for not prosecuting his case. There has been no meaningful activity by Plaintiff the Complaint was removed on May 19, 2025.

The Defendant has been prejudiced in that it has taken steps to further the case despite plaintiff's inaction. As to the third and fourth factors, it is recommended that they weigh heavily against the Plaintiff. The Motion to Dismiss and Order to Show Cause made it clear that dismissal of the case was under consideration by the Court. Plaintiff has ignored the Court's order and has failed to meaningfully participate in the case.

Dismissal is appropriate pursuant to the Court's inherent power to control its docket. Accordingly, it is RECOMMENDED that the Plaintiff's Complaint be involuntarily dismissed with prejudice pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) and the Court's inherent power and 2 that the Motion to Dismiss be DENIED AS MOOT. Signed this 14th day of January, 2026. s/ Charmiane G. Claxton
CHARMIANE G. CLAXTON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE ANY OBJECTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS TO THIS REPORT MUST BE FILED WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS AFTER BEING SERVED WITH A COPY OF THE REPORT.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). FAILURE TO FILE SAID OBJECTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS MAY CONSTITUTE A WAIVER AND/OR FORFEITURE OF THE OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE OBJECTIONS, EXCEPTIONS, AND ANY FURTHER APPEAL. 3