

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Marley West v. Equifax, et al.

Marley West · No. CV 25-07445 FMO (MAAx) · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California dismissed Marley West’s action against Equifax and other defendants without prejudice. The dismissal was based on lack of prosecution and failure to comply with the court’s order to show cause, pursuant to Local Rule 41 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Fernando M. Olguin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-07445 FMO (MAAx)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court dismissed the action without prejudice for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with a court order after plaintiff failed to respond to an order to show cause.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Marley West v. Equifax, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- consumer protection

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with the court's order to show cause.

HOLDINGS

- 1. A district court may dismiss an action without prejudice for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with its orders when the plaintiff fails to respond to an order to show cause.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the above-captioned case is dismissed, without prejudice, for lack of prosecution and for failure to comply with the orders of the court, pursuant to Local Rule 41.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had previously issued an order to show cause concerning dismissal for lack of prosecution. Plaintiff did not file the required written response by the court-ordered deadline. The court dismissed the action without prejudice for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court orders.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On October 30, 2025, the court ordered plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution and required a written response by November 6, 2025. Plaintiff filed no response. The court therefore dismissed the action without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Link v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-30, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 1388 (1962)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 JS-6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 MARLEY WEST,) NO. CV 25-07445 FMO (MAAx) 12 Plaintiff, 13 V.
ORDER DISMISSING ACTION WITHOUT) PREJUDICE 14) EQUIFAX, et al.,) 15 16
Defendants. VO 18 On October 30, 2025, the court issued an Order to Show Cause why this case
should not 19] be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

(Dkt. 29, Court’s Order of October 30, 2025). 20 A written response to the Order to Show Cause
was ordered to be filed no later than 21] November 6, 2025. As of the filing date of this Order, no
response has been filed to the court’s 22| Order to Show Cause. (See, generally, Dkt.).

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the above- captioned case is dismissed, without prejudice, for
lack of prosecution and for failure to comply with the orders of the court, pursuant to Local Rule
41. See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Link v. Wabash R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-30, 82 S.Ct. 1386,

1388 (1962). 26 | Dated this 25th day of November, 2025. 27 28 —remando Giga United States District Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/marley-west-v-equifax-et-al-z4s34ba0>