

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Keiron Elias v. J. Anaya, et al.

No. 2:23-cv-02924-MWF-JC, United States District Court for the Central District of California (April 21, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California dismissed Keiron Elias’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action for unreasonable failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders. The court reviewed and adopted the magistrate judge’s prior order finding the complaint deficient and concluded that dismissal was warranted after Plaintiff failed to amend or otherwise respond.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael W. Fitzgerald
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	April 21, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-02924-MWF-JC
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought a pro se 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil-rights action seeking damages. After a magistrate judge dismissed the complaint with leave to amend and Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint or otherwise comply with subsequent court orders, the district court dismissed the action sua sponte for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviewed the magistrate judge's nondispositive order dismissing the complaint with leave to amend and independently assessed whether sua sponte dismissal was warranted under the factors governing dismissal for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum opinion; persuasive at most
PARTIES	Keiron Elias v. J. Anaya, et al.

TOPICS

sanctions

civil procedure

section 1983

prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

prisoner litigation

federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court could review and adopt the magistrate judge's dismissal of the complaint with leave to amend before dismissing the entire action.
2. Whether dismissal was warranted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and the court's inherent authority because Plaintiff unreasonably failed to prosecute and failed to comply with court orders.
3. Whether the court had provided a pro se plaintiff adequate notice of the pleading deficiencies and a meaningful opportunity to amend before dismissal.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court properly reviewed and adopted the magistrate judge's order dismissing the complaint with leave to amend before dismissing the action.
2. Sua sponte dismissal was warranted because Plaintiff unreasonably failed to prosecute the action and failed to comply with the January Order despite repeated extensions, warnings, and opportunities to amend.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In determining whether to dismiss an action for failure to prosecute or failure to comply with court orders, a district court must consider several factors, namely (1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.” (4)

“IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is dismissed based upon Plaintiff's unreasonable failure to prosecute and his failure to comply with at least the January Order.” (5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Keiron Elias, a pro se incarcerated plaintiff, filed a § 1983 complaint seeking damages against multiple defendants at California State Prison, Los Angeles County. The magistrate judge found pleading deficiencies, including violation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and failure to state a viable claim, dismissed the complaint with leave to amend, and repeatedly extended the deadline for compliance. Despite explicit warnings and multiple opportunities, Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint, a notice of dismissal, or a notice of intent to stand on the original complaint, and did not respond to the final order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on March 23, 2023, and was granted leave to proceed without prepayment of filing fees. The magistrate judge screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A and 42 U.S.C. §

1997e(c), dismissed it with leave to amend, and directed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint, a notice of dismissal, or a notice of intent to stand on the complaint. After multiple extensions and an additional extension through February 28, 2025, Plaintiff neither filed the required document nor sought another extension. The district court reviewed and adopted the magistrate judge's prior dismissal and dismissed the action.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Branch v. Umphenour, 936 F.3d 994, 1004 (9th Cir. 2019)
- Williams v. King, 875 F.3d 500, 504 (9th Cir. 2017)
- McKeever v. Block, 932 F.2d 795, 797-98 (9th Cir. 1991)
- Bastidas v. Chappell, 791 F.3d 1155, 1162 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Hunt v. Pliler, 384 F.3d 1118, 1124 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Link v. Wabash Railroad Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-33 (1962)
- Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 506 U.S. 915 (1992)
- Edwards v. Marin Park, Inc., 356 F.3d 1058, 1065 (9th Cir. 2004)
- In re Eisen, 31 F.3d 1447, 1451 (9th Cir. 1994)
- Hernandez v. City of El Monte, 138 F.3d 393, 399 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Anderson v. Air West, Inc., 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976)
- Yourish v. California Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 989, 992 (9th Cir. 1999)