

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, EASTERN DIVISION

Regina Hodge v. City of St. Louis, et al.

Hodge · No. 4:26-cv-114-SRW · Decided April 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri dismissed Regina Hodge’s civil action against the City of St. Louis and other defendants without prejudice. The dismissal was based on her failure to comply with an order requiring an amended, signed complaint and her failure to prosecute; the court denied her motion to proceed in forma pauperis as moot and certified that an appeal would not be taken in good faith.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
DECIDED	April 15, 2026
DOCKET	4:26-cv-114-SRW
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court dismissed the action without prejudice sua sponte after Plaintiff failed to comply with an order requiring an amended, signed, court-form complaint.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Regina Hodge v. City of St. Louis, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court could dismiss the action without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure to comply with a court order and failure to prosecute.
2. Whether Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis became moot upon dismissal.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may dismiss an action sua sponte and without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) when the plaintiff fails to comply with a court order and fails to prosecute after receiving meaningful notice and adequate time to comply.
2. Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was denied as moot after the action was dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court will therefore dismiss this action, without prejudice, due to Plaintiff’s failure to comply with the Court’s February 25, 2026 Order and her failure to prosecute her case.”

“by the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases” (630-31)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Regina Hodge filed this civil action on January 27, 2026. The Court later ordered her to submit a signed amended complaint on a Court form within 30 days, but she did not respond, seek an extension, or otherwise comply despite notice and an opportunity to do so.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff commenced the civil action on January 27, 2026. On February 25, 2026, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint on a Court form and sign it within 30 days, warned that failure to comply could result in dismissal, and dismissed the action after Plaintiff neither complied nor requested additional time.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962)
- Brown v. Frey, 806 F.2d 801, 803 (8th Cir. 1986)

OPINION

Hodge

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

EASTERN DIVISION

REGINA HODGE,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) No. 4:26-cv-114-SRW) CITY OF ST. LOUIS, et al.)) Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon review of the file. Plaintiff Regina Hodge commenced this civil action on January 27, 2026. ECF No. 1. On February 25, 2026, the Court directed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint on a Court-form and to sign the complaint. ECF No. 3. Plaintiff was given 30 days to respond to the Order. Id. To date, Plaintiff has neither responded to the Court's Order, nor sought additional time to do so. Plaintiff was given meaningful notice of what was expected, she was cautioned that her case would be dismissed if she failed to timely comply, and she was given ample time to comply. The Court will therefore dismiss this action, without prejudice, due to Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's February 25, 2026 Order and her failure to prosecute her case. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); see also *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962) (the authority of a court to dismiss sua sponte for lack of prosecution is inherent power governed "by the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases"); *Brown v. Frey*, 806 F.2d 801, 803 (8th Cir. 1986) (a district court has the power to dismiss an action for the plaintiff's failure to comply with any court order). Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED without prejudice. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) is DENIED as moot. IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED that an appeal from this dismissal would not be taken in good faith. An Order of Dismissal will accompany this Memorandum and Order. Dated this 15th day of April, 2026.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE