

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
GEORGIA

Anthony J. Oliver v. Sandi West, et al.

No. 5:25-cv-265-MTT-AGH, United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia (March 10, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia dismissed Anthony J. Oliver’s civil action without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). The court found that Oliver failed to comply with court-imposed filing restrictions, failed to provide information requested in court orders, and failed to respond to an order to show cause and a defendants’ motion. The court denied the pending motions as moot and warned that future disrespectful or noncompliant conduct could result in filing sanctions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Marc T. Treadwell
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia
DECIDED	March 10, 2026
DOCKET	5:25-cv-265-MTT-AGH
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed a civil action in Georgia state court. Defendants removed it to the Northern District of Georgia, which transferred it to the Middle District of Georgia. After Plaintiff failed to comply with court orders and failed to respond to an order to show cause and a motion to dismiss, the district court dismissed the action without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A district court may dismiss an action sua sponte under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute or failure to obey a court order; dismissal without prejudice is generally appropriate when a litigant fails to comply with a court order, particularly after being warned.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order designated as a trial-court opinion and no precedential status stated.

TOPICS

civil procedure sanctions default due process

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure prisoner civil rights remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) because Plaintiff failed to comply with court orders and failed to prosecute the action.
2. Whether Plaintiff's outstanding motion to consolidate and Defendants' motion to extend deadlines or alternatively dismiss should be denied as moot following dismissal.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court may dismiss an action without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) when a plaintiff fails to prosecute or fails to comply with court orders, and dismissal was warranted because Oliver repeatedly failed to comply with the Court's orders and warnings.
2. Plaintiff's outstanding motion to consolidate and Defendants' motion to extend deadlines or alternatively dismiss were denied as moot after the action was dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A district court has authority to manage its docket to expeditiously resolve cases, and this authority includes the power to dismiss a case for failure to prosecute or failure to comply with the court's orders."

"In conclusion, this action is DISMISSED without prejudice due to Plaintiff's failure to follow the Court's Orders."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Oliver, a state prisoner, filed this action without complying with a state-court filing restriction imposed as a condition of her criminal sentence. The district court ordered her to disclose her Georgia litigation history and explain her noncompliance, but she did not provide the requested information and instead submitted disrespectful and threatening responses. After the Court issued an order to show cause and repeatedly warned that noncompliance would result in dismissal, Oliver failed to respond.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Oliver filed the action in the Superior Court of Monroe County and moved to proceed in forma pauperis. Defendants removed the action to the Northern District of Georgia, which transferred it to this Court. The Court ordered Oliver to disclose her litigation history and explain her compliance with a state-court filing restriction, later issued an order to show cause, and gave her additional time to respond. Oliver did not comply or respond, so the Court dismissed the action without prejudice for failure to follow court orders.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Oliver v. State, 876 S.E.2d 34, 50-51 (Ga. App. 2022)
- Oliver v. Cnty. of Chatham, No. CV417-101, 2018 WL 1573560, at *2 (S.D. Ga. Mar. 30, 2018)
- Oliver v. Cnty. of Effingham, No. CV418-120, 2019 WL 356803, at *2-3 (S.D. Ga. Jan. 29, 2019)
- Oliver v. Ameris Bank, No. 21-13005, 2023 WL 6159997, at *1-2 (11th Cir. Sept. 21, 2023)
- Oliver v. Lyft, Inc., No. CV419-063, No. CV419-125, 2019 WL 5388472, at *1 n.2 (S.D. Ga. Sept. 13, 2019)
- Oliver v. Luner, No. 2:18-cv-02562 VAP, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 220345, at *2-10 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 26, 2018)
- Oliver v. Field, 840 S.E.2d 124, 127 (Ga. App. 2020)
- Oliver v. City of Pooler, No. 4:18-cv-00100, 2019 WL 357980, at *1-2 (S.D. Ga. Jan. 29, 2019), report and recommendation adopted, 2019 WL 1005198 (S.D. Ga. Feb. 28, 2019)
- Oliver v. EHM Prods., Inc., No. 23-cv-02671, 2023 WL 6519755, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2023)
- Oliver v. Cnty. of Los Angeles, No. CV 15-07791, 2016 WL 11755117, at *13-14 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2016)
- Owens v. Pinellas Cnty. Sheriff's Dep't, 331 F. App'x 654, 656 (11th Cir. 2009)
- Moon v. Newsome, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989)
- Equity Lifestyle Props., Inc. v. Fla. Mowing & Landscape Serv., Inc., 556 F.3d 1232, 1240-41 (11th Cir. 2009)
- Brown v. Tallahassee Police Dep't, 205 F. App'x 802, 802 (11th Cir. 2006) (per curiam)
- Lopez v. Aransas Cnty. Indep. Sch. Dist., 570 F.2d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 1978)