

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, EASTERN DIVISION

Ribas v. Besler

Ribas · No. 4:25 CV 570 CDP · Decided May 21, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri dismisses Victor Manuel Ribas’s claims against Megan Besler with prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). The court finds a pattern of intentional delay, failure to prosecute, and willful noncompliance with court orders, including mediation and show-cause orders.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Catherine D. Perry
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
DECIDED	May 21, 2026
DOCKET	4:25 CV 570 CDP
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved to dismiss the removed diversity action for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), and alternatively for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6). The plaintiff did not oppose the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Rule 41(b), dismissal with prejudice is an extreme sanction appropriate for willful disobedience of court orders or a pattern of intentional delay. The sanction must be proportionate to the plaintiff’s transgressions, and the court balances the policy of allowing the plaintiff a day in court against preventing undue delay, avoiding court congestion, and preserving respect for court procedures.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; memorandum and order from a federal district court with no published reporter citation identified.
PARTIES	Victor Manuel Ribas v. Megan Besler

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

sanctions

civil procedure

mediation

remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal litigation

sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed with prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders.
2. Whether the plaintiff's repeated missed deadlines, failure to respond to motions, and disregard of show-cause and mediation orders constituted a pattern of intentional delay and willful disobedience warranting dismissal with prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. Dismissal with prejudice was appropriate because Ribas engaged in a pattern of intentional delay and willfully disregarded the court's orders.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“dismissal with prejudice is an extreme sanction that should be used only in cases of willful disobedience of a court order or where a litigant exhibits a pattern of intentional delay.”

“This does not mean that the district court must find that the appellant acted in bad faith, but requires only that he acted intentionally as opposed to accidentally or involuntarily.”

“Plaintiff’s practice of picking and choosing which portions of my orders he wants to follow provides strong support for inferring that his noncompliance is intentional.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action arose from allegations that Megan Besler accessed and monitored Victor Manuel Ribas's social media accounts, deleted or blocked social and professional connections, and deleted or hid posts. Ribas filed this action while a related defamation case between the parties was pending and undergoing settlement-related proceedings. After removal, Ribas repeatedly failed to comply with orders concerning consolidation, mediation, show-cause responses, and explanations for his noncompliance, and he failed to respond to motions to dismiss. The court found that this conduct delayed the case and demonstrated intentional disregard of court orders.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ribas filed this action in Missouri state court, and Besler removed it to the Eastern District of Missouri based on diversity jurisdiction. The court previously denied an earlier motion to dismiss without prejudice while referring the related action and this case to mediation. Ribas repeatedly failed to comply with mediation-related orders, show-cause orders, and deadlines, and did not oppose either motion to dismiss. The court dismissed the action with prejudice under Rule 41(b).

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Stahl v. U.S. Dep't of Agric., 327 F.3d 697, 700 (8th Cir. 2003)
- United States v. Jackson, 640 F.2d 614, 617 (8th Cir. 1981)
- Hutchins v. A.G. Edwards & Sons, Inc., 116 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (8th Cir. 1997)
- Moore v. St. Louis Music Supply Co., Inc., 539 F.2d 1191, 1193 (8th Cir. 1976)
- Hunt v. City of Minneapolis, 203 F.3d 524, 527-28 (8th Cir. 2000)
- Rodgers v. Curators of Univ. of Mo., 135 F.3d 1216, 1219 (8th Cir. 1998)
- Mann v. Lewis, 108 F.3d 145, 147 (8th Cir. 1997)
- Omaha Indian Tribe v. Tract I-Blackbird Bend Area, 933 F.2d 1462, 1468 (8th Cir. 1991) (per curiam)
- Garrison v. Int'l Paper Co., 714 F.2d 757, 760 (8th Cir. 1983)