

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA**

**Raymond Louis Reardon v. St. Tammany Parish Jail Medical
Department**

Reardon · No. 2:25-cv-02103 · Decided January 7, 2026

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA RAYMOND LOUIS REARDON CIVIL ACTION VERSUS NO. 25-2103 ST. TAMMANY PARISH JAIL SECTION AM@ (5) MEDICAL DEPARTMENT REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION In September 2025, pro se plaintiff, Raymond Louis Reardon, submitted this civil complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, against the defendant, St. Tammany Parish Jail Medical Department.

In his complaint, he alleges that he was denied physical therapy or any further medical attention after surgery on his arm and wrist. He requests monetary compensation. Upon filing, the Clerk's Office notified him that the complaint was for want of prosecution because he had not submitted the filing fee or an application to proceed.

The record indicates that the Clerk mailed the notice and standard IFP form to Reardon at the address he provided on his complaint and gave him 21 days to comply. Rec. Doc. 2. He failed to respond to that deficiency notice.

On November 25, 2025, the undersigned issued an order directing Reardon to pay the filing fee or submit a pauper application. Rec. Doc. 3. He was ordered to respond by December 15, 2025. He was also warned that if he failed to comply with the order, the undersigned would recommend dismissal of his civil complaint. No mail has been returned as undeliverable.

To date, Reardon has failed to comply with the Court's order. The authority of a federal court to dismiss a plaintiff's action because of failure to prosecute is clear. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure specifically provide that a court may, in its discretion, dismiss a plaintiff's action for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply. *M. W. C. v. L. R. v. L. R.*, 138 F.3d 1386, 1388–89, 8 L.Ed.2d 734 (1992); 835 F.2d at 1127; 531 F.2d 706, 707 (5th Cir.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b)); 835 F.2d 1126, 1127 (5th Cir. 1988). The Court's powers to dismiss for want of prosecution should be used sparingly, although it may be exercised. See *Link v. W. v. W.*, 138 F.3d 1386, 1388–89, 8 L.Ed.2d 734 (1992); 835 F.2d at 1127; 531 F.2d 706, 707 (5th Cir.

1976). A pro se litigant is not exempt from compliance with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law. *Birl v. Estelle*, Civ. Action No. 16-1541, 2018 WL 691650 (E.D. La. Feb. 2, 2018) (citing, 660 F.2d 592, 593 (5th Cir. 1981)). Reardon has ignored an express Court order to remedy the deficiency and pay the required filing fee or submit a completed pauper application.

In light of the foregoing, it is appropriate to dismiss plaintiff's complaint. If plaintiff intends to move forward with these proceedings, he has an opportunity to make that intent known within the objection window by submitting the filing fee or an application to proceed. 2 RECOMMENDATION RECOMMENDED DISMISSAL So the Court orders that plaintiff's complaint be dismissed for failure to prosecute or comply with this Court's order.

A party's failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation in a magistrate judge's report and recommendation within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy shall bar that party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district court, provided that the party shows that such consequences will result from a failure to object. ', 797 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir.

1996) () (citing 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)). New Orleans, Louisiana, this _____ day of January, 2026. MICHAEL B. NORTH UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Douglas ' referenced the previously applicable 10-day period for the filing of objections. Effective December 1, 2009, 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1) was amended to extend the period to 14 days. 3