

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA**

Christopher Dehut v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.

Dehut · No. CIV-25-644-G · Decided January 20, 2026

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA
CHRISTOPHER DEHUT,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) Case No. CIV-25-644-G) JPMORGAN CHASE
BANK, N.A.,)) Defendant.) ORDER Plaintiff Christopher Dehut initiated this action on April
29, 2025, in state court, alleging breach of contract, violation of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act,
and negligence against Defendant JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.

See Pet. (Doc. No. 1-2). The case was removed to this Court on June 11, 2025. Because Plaintiff
has failed to comply with the Court’s orders and applicable rules, the Court now dismisses the
action without prejudice.

I. Background On October 29, 2025, the Court held a status and scheduling conference in this
matter. See Doc. No. 14. Plaintiff failed to attend the conference or contact the Court regarding his
absence. Plaintiff further failed to participate in the preparation or submission of the joint status
report as prescribed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Court’s Local Civil Rules.

On October 31, 2025, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause within seven days for his failure to
attend the conference or to meaningfully assist in the preparation of the joint status report. See
Order to Show Cause (Doc. No. 16).

The Court’s show cause order was mailed to Plaintiff at his address of record. Plaintiff failed to
thereafter file a response, request an extension of time, or otherwise communicate with the Court.
On December 4, 2025, the Court issued a subsequent order directing Plaintiff to show cause
within seven days why this action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to
comply with the Court’s prior order.

See Second Order to Show Cause (Doc. No. 17). The order was mailed to Plaintiff at his address
of record. As of this date, Plaintiff has not filed a response, requested an extension of time to
comply, or otherwise contacted the Court regarding this action. II. Discussion Under Federal Rule
of Civil Procedure 41(b), if a plaintiff “fails to prosecute or to comply with these rules or a court
order,” the Court may dismiss the action.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). The Tenth Circuit “ha[s] consistently interpreted Rule 41(b) to permit courts
to dismiss actions sua sponte for a plaintiff’s failure to prosecute.” *Huggins v. Sup. Ct. of U.S.*,

480 F. App'x 915, 916-17 (10th Cir. 2012) (internal quotation marks omitted); see also *AdvantEdge Bus. Grp. v. Thomas E. Mestmaker & Assocs., Inc.*, 552 F.3d 1233, 1236 (10th Cir.

2009). If the dismissal is without prejudice, the Court generally need not follow any “particular procedures” in entering the dismissal order. *AdvantEdge Bus. Grp.*, 552 F.3d at 1236; see *Robledo-Valdez v. Smelser*, 593 F. App'x 771, 775 (10th Cir. 2014). Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this action and to comply with the Court's orders leaves the Court unable “to achieve an orderly and expeditious” resolution of this action.

Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-31 (1962) (discussing the inherent power of a court to dismiss suits for lack of prosecution on its own initiative). **CONCLUSION** Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. A separate judgment shall be entered. **IT IS SO ORDERED** this 20th day of January, 2026. United States District Judge