

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

William Coney v. Jimenez, et al.

Coney · No. 2:25-cv-00822-APG-EJY · Decided January 21, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada dismissed William Coney’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action without prejudice because he failed to provide an updated address and submit a non-inmate in forma pauperis application as ordered. The court concluded that the relevant dismissal factors favored dismissal and directed the Clerk to enter judgment and close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	January 21, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00822-APG-EJY
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. After the magistrate judge ordered him to update his address and submit a non-inmate application to proceed in forma pauperis, plaintiff failed to comply, and the district court dismissed the action without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the discretionary five-factor framework governing dismissal for failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- sanctions
- civil procedure
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights
- constitutional law
- federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should dismiss the action without prejudice because plaintiff failed to update his address as ordered.

2. Whether the five factors governing dismissal for failure to obey a court order favored dismissal under the circumstances.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may dismiss an action when a party fails to obey a court order or comply with applicable local rules, pursuant to the court's inherent power to control its docket.
2. The public interest in expeditious resolution, the court's need to manage its docket, the risk of prejudice to defendants, and the inadequacy of less drastic alternatives outweighed the policy favoring disposition on the merits; dismissal was therefore warranted.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Coney filed a § 1983 action alleging constitutional violations suffered while incarcerated. The magistrate judge ordered him to update his address and submit a non-inmate IFP application by January 16, 2026. He did neither, and mail from the court was returned as undeliverable, preventing the court and defendants from sending case-related documents and orders.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 16, 2025, the magistrate judge ordered Coney to update his address and submit a non-inmate IFP application by January 16, 2026. Coney did not comply, and court mail was returned as undeliverable. The district court considered the Ninth Circuit's five dismissal factors and dismissed the action without prejudice, directing the clerk to enter judgment and close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)
- In re Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig., 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976)
- Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)