

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
MISSISSIPPI, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Bradley Glenn v. State of Louisiana, et al.

Glenn · No. 1:25-cv-00049-LG-RPM · Decided February 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi dismissed Bradley Glenn’s pro se action without prejudice for failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute. The court relied on Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and its inherent authority to manage its docket, noting that Glenn had not responded to multiple orders or maintained a current address.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Louis Guirola, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, Southern Division
DECIDED	February 2, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00049-LG-RPM
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The pro se plaintiff initiated a civil action, failed to respond to multiple court orders and show-cause orders, and the district court sua sponte dismissed the action without prejudice for failure to obey court orders.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court acted sua sponte under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and its inherent power to manage its docket; no appellate standard of review was applied.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- sanctions
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice for Glenn's failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may dismiss an action without prejudice when a plaintiff fails to obey court orders, fails to maintain communication with the court, and demonstrates a lack of interest in prosecuting the case.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court may dismiss an action for a plaintiff’s failure to prosecute under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and the Court’s “inherent power . . . to manage [its] own affairs.””

“Such a “sanction is necessary in order to prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases and to avoid congestion in the calendars of the District Courts.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Glenn stopped contacting the court after April 1, 2025 and did not respond to an inquiry, an order to show cause, or a second and final order to show cause. The court had warned him seven times that failure to comply with court orders or keep the court informed of his current mailing address could result in dismissal. Two orders were returned as undeliverable, and the defendants had not appeared or been required to respond to the complaint.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Bradley Glenn filed the action on February 21, 2025. The court ordered him to respond to an inquiry, then issued an order to show cause and a second and final order to show cause after he failed to respond. The orders were mailed to his address of record, with two returned as undeliverable. Because Glenn neither responded nor updated his address, the court dismissed the action without prejudice and stated that a separate final judgment would be entered.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-31 (1962)
- McCullough v. Lynaugh, 835 F.2d 1126, 1127 (5th Cir. 1988)