

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Ford v. Adams

Ford · No. 24-cv-06807-EKL · Decided August 12, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California dismissed Jasper Ford’s action without prejudice after he failed to file an amended complaint within the court-ordered deadline. The court also cited his failure to comply with the local rule concerning keeping the court informed of his address and directed the Clerk to close the file.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Eumi K. Lee
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	August 12, 2025
DOCKET	24-cv-06807-EKL
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court dismissed Plaintiff's complaint with leave to amend, warned that failure to amend within 28 days could result in dismissal, and later dismissed the action without prejudice after Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint or otherwise communicate with the court.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not established in the source metadata.
PARTIES	Jasper Ford v. Adams, et al.

TOPICS

- motion to amend
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice because Plaintiff failed to comply with the court's order requiring an amended complaint and failed to comply with Civil Local Rule 3-11.

HOLDINGS

1. A plaintiff's failure to file an amended complaint after dismissal with leave to amend, together with failure to comply with Civil Local Rule 3-11, warranted dismissal of the action without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Given that Ford failed to comply with Civil Local Rule 3-11 and failed to file an amended complaint, the matter is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.” (1)

“holding that further action by district court is necessary where plaintiff fails to amend after dismissal with leave to amend” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had previously screened Jasper Ford's complaint and granted leave to amend, with a warning that the case could be dismissed if no amended complaint was filed within 28 days. The order was initially returned as undeliverable, but the court updated Ford's address and re-sent it. More than two months later, Ford had not filed an amended complaint, sought an extension, or communicated with the court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 22, 2025, the court screened Ford's complaint and dismissed it with leave to amend. After the order was returned as undeliverable, the court updated Ford's address and re-sent the order on June 11, 2025. Ford did not file an amended complaint, request an extension, or otherwise communicate with the court, so the court dismissed the matter without prejudice and directed the Clerk to close the file.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- WMX Techs. v. Miller, 104 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1441 (9th Cir. 1988)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7
JASPER FORD, Case No. 24-cv-06807-EKL 8 Plaintiff, ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITHOUT 9
v. PREJUDICE 10 ADAMS, et al., 11 Defendants. 12 13 On April 22, 2025, the Court screened
Plaintiff Jasper Ford’s complaint and filed an order 14 || of dismissal with leave to amend. ECF
No. 11.

The order warned Ford that the case may be 3 15 || dismissed if he failed to file an amended complaint within 28 days. /d. at5. After the mailing was a 16 returned to the Clerk as undeliverable, the Court updated Ford's address and re-sent the order on 3 17 June 11, 2025. ECF No. 13. More than two months later, the Court has not received an amended S 18 || complaint, request for extension of time, or any other communication from Ford.

Given that Ford 19 || failed to comply with Civil Local Rule 3-11 and failed to file an amended complaint, the matter is 20 |} DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. See *WMX Techs. v. Miller*, 104 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 21 1997) (holding that further action by district court is necessary where plaintiff fails to amend after 22 || dismissal with leave to amend); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1441 (9th Cir.

1988) (affirming 23 || dismissal of pro se prisoner's complaint for failing to notify court of his change of address). 24 The Clerk shall close the file. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 || Dated: August 12, 2025 27 Eumi K. Lee 28 United States District Judge