

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE, NASHVILLE DIVISION

Trevor S. Adamson v. Daniel A. Horwitz et al.

Adamson · No. 3:25-cv-00420 · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee dismisses Trevor S. Adamson's complaint with prejudice for failure to comply with court orders requiring payment of the civil filing fee and for want of prosecution. The court grants Defendant Daniel A. Horwitz's motion to alter or amend the prior dismissal without prejudice and states that a separate judgment will follow.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Laurie J. Michelson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	3:25-cv-00420
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court amended its prior dismissal order after granting Defendant Daniel A. Horwitz's motion to alter or amend the judgment, dismissing Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice for failure to comply with court orders and for want of prosecution.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

[civil procedure](#) [default](#) [pleadings](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[civil procedure](#) [civil rights](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court could dismiss the complaint for failure to comply with filing-fee and deficiency orders and for want of prosecution.
2. Whether the dismissal should be entered with prejudice rather than without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may sua sponte dismiss an action when a plaintiff fails to comply with court orders or fails to prosecute the case, relying on Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(f), 37(b)(2)(A)(v), and 41(b), as well as the court's inherent authority to manage its docket and administer justice.
2. The complaint was properly dismissed with prejudice after the court granted Defendant's motion to alter or amend the prior dismissal order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court thus DISMISSES WITH PREJUDICE Adamson’s case for failure to comply with the Court’s orders and want of prosecution.” (Opinion text)

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

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, failed to submit the full civil filing fee after the court denied his in forma pauperis application and repeatedly ordered him to correct filing deficiencies. He also failed to file a compliant amended in forma pauperis application despite multiple deadlines and explicit warnings that noncompliance would result in dismissal. The court found that Plaintiff remained noncompliant and had failed to prosecute the action.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court denied Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis without prejudice and ordered him either to file a compliant amended application or pay the full filing fee. Plaintiff failed to comply with successive deficiency orders and warnings, including an order requiring payment of the full civil filing fee. The court initially dismissed the complaint without prejudice on November 20, 2025; Defendant then moved to alter or amend the judgment to make the dismissal with prejudice, and the court granted that motion in this amended order.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Rogers v. City of Warren, 302 F. App'x 371, 375 (6th Cir. 2008)
- Link v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630–31 (1962)
- Gibbons v. Asset Acceptance Corp., No. 05-467, 2006 WL 3452521, at *1 (S.D. Ohio Nov. 29, 2006)
- Pilgrim v. Littlefield, 92 F.3d 413, 416 (6th Cir. 1996)

- Jourdan v. Jabe, 951 F.2d 108, 110 (6th Cir. 1991)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-middle-district-of-tenn/2025/trevor-s-adamson-v-daniel-a-horwitz-et-al-7sy6drsv>