

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Juan Jimenez v. B. Cates, et al.

Jimenez v. Cates · No. 1:23-cv-01376-CDB · Decided December 16, 2025

SUMMARY

This is an order from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California in Juan Jimenez v. B. Cates, et al., Case No. 1:23-cv-01376-CDB. The court directs the Clerk to update the pro se plaintiff’s address and orders him to show cause within 21 days why the action should not be dismissed for failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute. The order also permits the plaintiff to file a first amended complaint, a notice of voluntary dismissal, or notice electing to stand on his original complaint.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 16, 2025
DOCKET	1:23-cv-01376-CDB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. After the court screened the complaint and granted leave to amend or voluntarily dismiss, the plaintiff failed to respond. The court ordered him to show cause why the action should not be dismissed without prejudice for failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court exercised its inherent authority to manage its docket and considered whether dismissal would be warranted for failure to prosecute, failure to obey a court order, and failure to comply with local rules.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- sanctions
- civil procedure
- section 1983
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights
- sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court may impose dismissal as a sanction for failure to obey a court order and failure to prosecute.
2. Whether plaintiff should be ordered to show cause why the action should not be dismissed after failing to respond to the screening order and failing to maintain a current address with the court.

HOLDINGS

1. A district court may dismiss an action under its inherent docket-management authority when a party fails to prosecute, obey a court order, or comply with applicable local rules.
2. A pro se party has a continuing obligation to notify the court and opposing parties of any change of address, and failure to do so may support dismissal without prejudice when court mail is returned and the party does not provide a current address within the period specified by the local rules.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“District courts have inherent power to control their dockets” (at 2)

“Failure to comply with this Order to Show Cause (OSC) will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed without prejudice for Plaintiff’s failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Juan Jimenez is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in a § 1983 civil-rights action. The court's November 20, 2025 screening order found that his complaint failed to state a cognizable claim and gave him 21 days to amend or voluntarily dismiss. Plaintiff did not respond, request an extension, or update his address after at least two prison transfers, although returned mail and a CDCR inmate-locator search indicated that he was housed at the Substance Abuse Treatment Facility in Corcoran, California.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was filed on September 20, 2023. On November 20, 2025, the court found that the complaint failed to state a cognizable claim against any named defendant and granted plaintiff 21 days to file a first amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal. Plaintiff did neither, did not request an extension, and had not kept the court apprised of his address after multiple transfers. The court directed the clerk to update his address and ordered plaintiff to show cause within 21 days; the order states that noncompliance will result in a recommendation of dismissal without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Thompson v. Housing Authority, City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)

- *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir. 1987)
- *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california/2025/juan-jimenez-v-b-cates-et-al-vuumvjy8>