

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Allen Hammler v. MTS Medication Technologies, Aurobindo Pharma
USA, Inc., Zydus Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., J. Macomber, Dotson,
Martinez, Gonzales, Allen, Matias, Pye, C. Morales, L. Gonzalez,
Castillo, Leanna Lundy, et al.**

Hammler v. MTS Medication Technologies · No. CV 25-4454 JGB (SPx) · Decided December 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California dismissed Allen Hammler’s action after he failed to pay the filing fee within the deadline set after denial of his in forma pauperis request. The court dismissed the case under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to comply with court orders and directed the Clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jesus G. Bernal
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	December 17, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-4454 JGB (SPx)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court sua sponte dismissed an incarcerated pro se plaintiff's complaint after he failed to pay the filing fee within the deadline established by a court order denying his request to proceed in forma pauperis.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A district court may sua sponte dismiss an action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute or failure to comply with court orders after weighing the relevant dismissal factors; the factors need not be expressly or mechanically addressed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated and no reporter citation appears.

PARTIES

Allen Hammler v. MTS Medication Technologies, Aurobindo Pharma USA, Inc., Zydus Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., J. Macomber, Dotson, Martinez, Gonzales, Allen, Matias, Pye, C. Morales, L. Gonzalez, Castillo, Leanna Lundy, Does 1-10

TOPICS

sanctions

civil procedure

pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal courts

prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court could sua sponte dismiss the action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for Plaintiff's failure to comply with the order requiring payment of the filing fee.
2. Whether the relevant dismissal factors supported dismissal rather than a less drastic sanction.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may sua sponte dismiss an action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) when a plaintiff fails to prosecute the action or comply with a court order, including an order requiring payment of the filing fee.
2. Dismissal was appropriate because the public interest in expeditious resolution, the court's need to manage its docket, the presumed prejudice from unreasonable delay, and the unavailability of realistic lesser sanctions outweighed the policy favoring disposition on the merits.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Before dismissing an action for either failure to prosecute, failure to obey a court order, or failure to follow the local rules, a court must weigh several factors: (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 the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases of their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions." (at 1)

"In sum, the Court concludes that four of the five factors weigh in favor of dismissing this action in its entirety." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Allen Hammler, an incarcerated pro se plaintiff, filed a civil complaint against pharmaceutical companies and individual defendants. The court denied his request to proceed in forma pauperis and ordered him to pay the filing fee within thirty days. He failed to pay the fee by the deadline and offered no explanation for the noncompliance.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the complaint on May 5, 2025. On September 11, 2025, the court denied Plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis and ordered him to pay the filing fee within thirty days, warning that failure to do so would result in dismissal. Plaintiff did not pay the fee, and the court dismissed the action for failure to comply with court orders and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Wolff v. California, 318 F.R.D. 627, 630 (C.D. Cal. 2016)
- Anderson v. Air W., Inc., 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976)
- Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642-43 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Nealey v. Transportacion Maritima Mexicana, S.A., 662 F.2d 1275, 1279 (9th Cir. 1981)
- Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1261-62
- Sw. Marine Inc. v. Danzig, 217 F.3d 1128, 1138 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Moore v. Telfon Commc'ns Corp., 589 F.2d 959, 967-68 (9th Cir. 1978)
- Oliva v. Sullivan, 958 F.2d 272, 274 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv., 833 F.2d 128, 132-33 (9th Cir. 1987)