

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN

Latonia Snowden v. John Does, Katz Properties, and Unknown

Snowden · No. 25-CV-867-JPS · Decided November 26, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin dismissed Latonia Snowden’s action without prejudice after she failed to file an amended complaint within the deadline set by the Court. The Court also denied as moot her motions to take judicial notice and to file documents electronically.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	J. P. Stadtmueller
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
DECIDED	November 26, 2025
DOCKET	25-CV-867-JPS
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After screening Plaintiff’s pro se complaint, the court denied in forma pauperis status without prejudice, dismissed certain claims with prejudice, granted leave to amend the remaining claims, and warned that failure to amend within 30 days would result in dismissal. Plaintiff did not timely amend, and the court dismissed the action without prejudice for failure to prosecute.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court exercised its authority to dismiss sua sponte for failure to diligently prosecute the action and failure to comply with a court-ordered deadline.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Latonia Snowden v. John Does, Katz Properties, Unknown

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings
- motion to amend

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should deny as moot Plaintiff's motion to take judicial notice of certain matters and motion to electronically file documents after Plaintiff failed to comply with the deadline to amend.
2. Whether the court could dismiss the action sua sponte without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure to file an amended complaint and failure to diligently prosecute the action.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may dismiss an action sua sponte, without prejudice, when the plaintiff fails to comply with a court-ordered deadline and thereby fails to diligently prosecute the action.
2. Plaintiff's motion to take judicial notice and motion to electronically file documents were denied as moot because the action was being dismissed for failure to comply with the order requiring amendment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A good judge sets deadlines, and the judge has a right to assume that deadlines will be honored." (157)

"[D]istrict courts have the inherent power to remedy dilatory conduct by dismissing a case for want of prosecution without a motion from the opposing party." (548)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Latonia Snowden filed a pro se civil action against John Does, Katz Properties, and Unknown defendants. Following screening, the court gave her 30 days to amend certain claims and warned that failure to do so would result in dismissal. Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint by the deadline, instead filing a supplemental statement and a motion for permission to file electronically.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

In October 2025, the court screened the complaint and concluded that claims under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1030, 2511, and 2261A could not be cured by amendment, while other claims potentially could be amended. The court dismissed the specified statutory claims with prejudice and allowed Plaintiff 30 days to amend the remaining claims, expressly warning that failure to do so would result in dismissal without further notice. Plaintiff instead filed a supplemental statement and a motion to electronically file documents, but did not file an amended complaint. The court denied those motions as moot and dismissed the entire action without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Spears v. City of Indianapolis*, 74 F.3d 153, 157 (7th Cir. 1996)

- *Harrington v. City of Chicago*, 433 F.3d 542, 548 (7th Cir. 2006)
- *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–31 (1962)
- *O’Rourke Bros., Inc. v. Nesbitt Burns, Inc.*, 201 F.3d 948, 952 (7th Cir. 2000)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN LATONIA SNOWDEN, Plaintiff, Case No. 25-CV-867-JPS v. JOHN DOES, KATZ PROPERTIES, ORDER and UNKNOWN, Defendants. In October 2025, this Court screened Plaintiff Latonia Snowden’s (“Plaintiff”) pro se complaint, denied her motion to proceed in forma pauperis without prejudice, and denied Plaintiff’s remaining pending motions.

ECF No. 8. The Court concluded that none of Plaintiff’s claims could proceed as pled and amendment as to her 18 U.S.C. §§ 1030, 2511, and 2261A claims would be futile, but her remaining claims could possibly benefit from amendment. *Id.* Accordingly, the Court granted Plaintiff 30 days to amend her complaint as to her remaining claims but dismissed with prejudice her 18 U.S.C. §§ 1030, 2511, and 2261A claims.

Id. at 18–19. More recently, Plaintiff filed a “supplemental statement,” which the Court construes as a motion to take judicial notice of certain matters. See generally ECF No. 9.1 That same day, Plaintiff filed a motion for permission to electronically file documents via CM/ECF. ECF No. 10.

The Court will deny both motions as moot, however, because Plaintiff has failed to abide by the Court’s October 14, 2025 order. ECF No. 8. 1Plaintiff suggested that “a previous motion to seal [her] personal information remains pending.” ECF No. 9-1. at 4.

However, there is no such At that time, the Court warned Plaintiff that failure to file an amended complaint within 30 days of the order’s entry would result in the dismissal of her case without further notice. *Id.* at 18. “A good judge sets deadlines, and the judge has a right to assume that deadlines will be honored.” *Spears v. City of Indianapolis*, 74 F.3d 153, 157 (7th Cir.

1996). “Whenever it appears to the Court that the plaintiff is not diligently prosecuting the action... the Court may enter an order of dismissal with or without prejudice.” CIV. L.R. 41(c). The Court may do so sua sponte. *Harrington v. City of Chicago*, 433 F.3d 542, 548 (7th Cir. 2006) (“[D]istrict courts have the inherent power to remedy dilatory conduct by dismissing a case for want of prosecution without a motion from the opposing party.” (citing *Link v. Wabash R.R.*

Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630–31 (1962) and *O’Rourke Bros., Inc. v. Nesbitt Burns, Inc.*, 201 F.3d 948, 952 (7th Cir. 2000))). Because Plaintiff has failed to file an amended complaint within 30 days of the Court’s October 14th order, ECF No. 8, the Court will now dismiss this action in its entirety, without prejudice.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff Latonia Snowden's motion to take judicial notice of certain matters, ECF No. 9, be and the same is hereby DENIED as moot; IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Latonia Snowden's motion to electronically file, ECF No. 10, be and the same is hereby DENIED as moot; and IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case be and the same is hereby DISMISSED without prejudice.

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly. Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 26th day of November, 2025. A vo =] — Bye i. P. Stand mueller 'S. District Judge Page 3 of 3