

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Sanchez de Tagle v. Nguyen

Sanchez de Tagle · No. 25-cv-01886-VKD · Decided April 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California ordered the plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. The order states that the plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint by the court-ordered deadline and directs him to respond by April 25, 2025, warning that nonresponse may lead to reassignment and a recommendation for dismissal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Virginia K. DeMarchi
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	April 11, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-01886-VKD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After screening the complaint and granting plaintiff leave to amend, the court issued an order to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Orlando Sanchez de Tagle v. Derick Nguyen

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings
- service of process

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should require plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders.
2. Whether the court possesses inherent authority to dismiss an action sua sponte to ensure the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal court possesses inherent power to dismiss an action sua sponte to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had screened Sanchez de Tagle's complaint and stayed service of process. Plaintiff was granted leave to file an amended complaint by March 28, 2025, but the docket showed that no amended complaint had been filed by that deadline. The court therefore required plaintiff to explain why the action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 5, 2025, the court screened plaintiff's complaint, stayed service of process, and granted leave to file an amended complaint by March 28, 2025. Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint by the deadline. The court ordered plaintiff to respond by April 25, 2025, warning that failure to respond would result in reassignment to a district judge with a recommendation for dismissal.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-33 (1962)