

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Emma Dunn and Alana Dunn v. Marclite Electrical Corporation
Florida, et al.**

Dunn · No. 1:25-cv-00565-JLT-BAM · Decided December 30, 2025

OPINION

Dunn

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4

5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

6 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7 8 EMMA DUNN and ALANA DUNN, Case No. 1:25-cv-00565-JLT-BAM 9 Plaintiffs,
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

REGARDING DISMISSAL OF ACTION FOR

10 v. FAILURE TO PROSECUTE

11 MARCLITE ELECTRICAL

CORPORATION FLORIDA, et al., 12 Defendants. 13 14 I. Background 15 Plaintiffs Emma
Dunn and Alana Dunn, proceeding pro se, initiated this civil action 16 against defendants on May
12, 2025. On November 7, 2025, the Court granted Plaintiffs leave to 17 amend and directed
Plaintiffs to file their second amended complaint within thirty days. (Doc. 18 15.) The order sent
to Plaintiff Emma Dunn was returned as “Undeliverable, Return to Sender, 19 Attempted – Not
Know, Unable to Forward” on November 24, 2025. (See Docket.) 20 On November 24, 2025,
Plaintiff Alana Dunn filed a document titled “Dismissal without 21 Prejudice.” (Doc. 16.) The
Court construed the filing as a notice of voluntary dismissal without 22 prejudice under Federal
Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a). (Doc. 17.) Plaintiff Alana Dunn’s action 23 against defendants was
therefore terminated by operation of law under Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i). (Id.) 24 Additionally, the
Court noted that mail sent to Plaintiff Emma Dunn was returned as 25 undeliverable and informed
her of the requirement under Local Rule 183 to keep the Court 26 apprised as to her current
address. (Id. at 1 n.1.) 27 II. Discussion 28 As Plaintiff Emma Dunn was previously informed, she
is required to keep the Court 1 apprised of her current address at all times. Local Rule 183(b)
provides: 2 Address Changes. A party appearing in propria persona shall keep the Court and
opposing parties advised as to his or her current address. If mail directed to a 3 plaintiff in propria
persona by the Clerk is returned by the U.S. Postal Service, and if such plaintiff fails to notify the
Court and opposing parties within thirty 4 (30) days thereafter of a current address, the Court may
dismiss the action without prejudice for failure to prosecute. 5 6 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure

41(b) also provides for dismissal of an action for failure to prosecute.¹ Plaintiff Emma Dunn's address change was due no later than December 24, 2025. Plaintiff Emma Dunn has failed to file a change of address or otherwise update the Court. She also has failed to file a second amended complaint. The Court will therefore recommend that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. ¹² "In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, the district court is ¹³ required to weigh several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; ¹⁴ (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public ¹⁵ policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic ¹⁶ sanctions." *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440 (9th Cir. 1988) (internal quotation marks and ¹⁷ citation omitted); *In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation*, 460 F.3d 1217, ¹⁸ 1226 (9th Cir. 2006). These factors guide a court in deciding what to do and are not conditions ¹⁹ that must be met in order for a court to take action. *In re PPA*, 460 F.3d at 1226 (citation ²⁰ omitted). ²¹ Given Plaintiff Emma Dunn's failure to update her address, file an amended complaint, or ²² otherwise respond to this Court's orders, the need for expeditious resolution of litigation and the ²³ Court's need to manage its docket weigh in favor of dismissal. *In re PPA*, 460 F.3d at 1227. The ²⁴ third factor, risk of prejudice to the defendant, also weighs in favor of dismissal, as a presumption ²⁵ of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in prosecuting an action. *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor usually weighs against dismissal ²⁷ 1 Courts may dismiss actions sua sponte under Rule 41(b) based on the plaintiff's failure to prosecute. ²⁸ *Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U. S. Forest Serv.*, 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005) (citation omitted). ¹ because public policy favors disposition on the merits. *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 ² (9th Cir. 2002). However, "this factor lends little support to a party whose responsibility it is to ³ move a case toward disposition on the merits but whose conduct impedes progress in that ⁴ direction," which is the case here. *In re PPA*, 460 F.3d at 1228 (citation omitted). More ⁵ importantly, given the Court's apparent inability to communicate with Plaintiff, there are no other ⁶ reasonable alternatives available to address Plaintiff Emma Dunn's failure to prosecute this action ⁷ and her failure to apprise the Court of her current address. *Id.* at 1228–29; *Carey*, 856 F.2d at 8 ⁸ 1441. ⁹ III. Conclusion and Recommendation ¹⁰ Based on the above, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed ¹¹ without prejudice based on Plaintiff Emma Dunn's failure to prosecute this action. Fed. R. Civ. ¹² P. 41(b); L.R. 183(b). ¹³ These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District ¹⁴ Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within ¹⁵ fourteen (14) days after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, the parties may ¹⁶ file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to ¹⁷ Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Objections, if any, shall not exceed ¹⁸ fifteen (15) pages or include exhibits. Exhibits may be referenced by document and page ¹⁹ number if already in the record before the Court. Any pages filed in excess of the 15-page ²⁰ limit may not be considered. Plaintiff is advised that failure to

file objections within the 21 specified time may result in the waiver of the “right to challenge the magistrate’s factual 22 findings” on appeal. *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838–39 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)). 24 IT IS SO ORDERED. 25 26 Dated: December 30, 2025 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe _

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

27 28