

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jasmen Lavar Hall v. Ironwood State Prison

Hall v. Ironwood State Prison · No. 2:24-cv-2701-JGB-RAO · Decided September 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California dismisses Jasmen Lavar Hall’s civil rights action without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). The dismissal is based on Hall’s failure to file an amended complaint and failure to respond to the court’s order to show cause.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jesus G. Bernal
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	September 11, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-2701-JGB-RAO
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se prisoner civil-rights action dismissed without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the five-factor Ninth Circuit test for dismissal for failure to prosecute or failure to comply with court orders.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Jasmen Lavar Hall v. Ironwood State Prison, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss
- prisoners rights
- section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) because Plaintiff failed to file the required amended complaint, failed to respond to the order to show cause, and failed to prosecute.

HOLDINGS

1. Dismissal without prejudice was appropriate because Plaintiff failed to obey the court's orders and failed to prosecute the action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“For the reasons set forth below, the Court dismisses this action for failure to obey court orders and to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).” (at 1)

“Four factors favor dismissal and one factor weighs slightly against dismissal. Accordingly, dismissal of this action without prejudice is appropriate.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a California state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a civil-rights complaint. After the case was transferred, the court granted in forma pauperis status and dismissed the complaint with leave to amend, setting a deadline for a First Amended Complaint and warning that noncompliance could result in dismissal. Plaintiff did not file the amended complaint or respond to the subsequent order to show cause.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a civil-rights complaint in the Southern District of California, and the action was transferred to the Central District of California. After granting in forma pauperis status, the court dismissed the original complaint with leave to amend and ordered Plaintiff to file a First Amended Complaint. Plaintiff instead filed grievance-related documents, failed to file the amended complaint, and failed to respond to an order to show cause; the court then dismissed the action without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-63 (9th Cir. 1992)
- *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629-31 (1962)
- *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 642-43 (9th Cir. 2002)
- *Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 990-91 (9th Cir. 1999)
- *Ash v. Cvetkov*, 739 F.2d 493, 496 (9th Cir. 1984)
- *Anderson v. Air W., Inc.*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976)
- *In re Eisen*, 31 F.3d 1447, 1452-53 (9th Cir. 1994)
- *Morris v. Morgan Stanley & Co.*, 942 F.2d 648, 652 (9th Cir. 1991)

