

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, PANAMA CITY DIVISION

Roland Graybill and Brittany Grumbling v. Florida Department of
Children and Families, et al.

Graybill · No. 5:25-cv-280-MW-MJF · Decided December 30, 2025

SUMMARY

A United States magistrate judge recommends that the action be dismissed without prejudice because the plaintiffs failed to comply with two court orders and failed to prosecute the case. The recommendation also asks the clerk to close the case file and advises the parties of the fourteen-day deadline for filing objections.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, Panama City Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael J. Frank
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, Panama City Division
DECIDED	December 30, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-280-MW-MJF
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Report and recommendation on dismissal of a civil action for failure to comply with court orders and failure to prosecute.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Dismissal for failure to comply with a court order or failure to prosecute is committed to the district court's discretion and may be ordered sua sponte under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential report and recommendation
PARTIES	Roland Graybill, Brittany Grumbling v. Florida Department of Children and Families, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal civil rights procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice because Plaintiffs failed to comply with two court orders.
2. Whether the action should be dismissed sua sponte for failure to prosecute.

HOLDINGS

1. The magistrate judge recommended that the action be dismissed without prejudice because Plaintiffs failed to comply with two court orders, failed to prosecute the action, and offered no excuse or good cause for their failures.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Federal courts possess an inherent power to dismiss a complaint for failure to comply with a court order.”
(Discussion)

“Because Plaintiffs failed to comply with court orders and failed to prosecute this action the undersigned respectfully RECOMMENDS that the District Court:” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs were ordered to file an amended complaint on a court-approved form by November 17, 2025. They failed to comply, and they also failed to respond to a subsequent order requiring them to explain their noncompliance and show cause by December 15, 2025. Plaintiffs offered no excuse or good cause for either failure.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge ordered Plaintiffs to file an amended complaint on an approved form by November 17, 2025. After Plaintiffs failed to comply, the magistrate judge ordered them to show cause by December 15, 2025, and again warned that noncompliance could result in dismissal. Plaintiffs did not comply with either order, leading the magistrate judge to recommend dismissal without prejudice and closure of the case.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

None. The magistrate judge recommended that the District Court dismiss the action without prejudice and direct the clerk to close the case file. The recommendation was subject to objections within fourteen days.

CASES CITED

- *Foudy v. Indian River County Sheriff's Office*, 845 F.3d 1117, 1126 (11th Cir. 2017)
- *Link v. Wabash Railroad Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 632 (1962)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-fl/2025/roland-graybill-and-brittany-grumbling-v-florida-department-i571yo8h>