

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

_____)	
YOLANDA YOUNG,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 09-464 (RBW)
)	
COVINGTON & BURLING, LLP, <u>et al.</u> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER

The Court scheduled an initial status conference in this matter for 9:30 a.m. on May 29, 2009. The plaintiff failed to appear at the conference, and the defendants moved to dismiss this case for want of prosecution. In light of the plaintiff's failure to appear at the conference, her failure to abide by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules by not responding to motions and other deadlines, and conducting herself in a manner that has impeded the defendants' ability to defend against this action,¹ and upon consideration of the applicable legal authority, Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) ("If the plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with these rules or a court order, a defendant may move to dismiss the action or any claim against it."); Cf. Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 49 (1991) ("The authority of a court to dismiss sua sponte for lack of prosecution has generally been considered an 'inherent power,' governed not

¹ Examples of the plaintiff's conduct which either transgress the rules of the Court or have impeded the defendants' ability to defend against this action include: (1) plaintiff's counsel's failure to indicate on the record that the plaintiff, who initiated this matter pro se, had retained legal representation; (2) her failure to respond to defendant Natale and Wittig's March 11, 2009 motion to dismiss prior to the Court's Order instructing her that her failure to reply could result in dismissal by consent; (3) her failure to meet and confer with the defendants prior to the scheduling conference and only doing so after the Court issued an Order extending the scheduling conference deadline and instructing her that her failure to meet in accordance with the rules of the Court could result in dismissal of the case for want of prosecution; (4) her failure to respond to the defendants' March 11, 2009 motion to strike portions of her complaint; and (5) her failure to appear at the May 29, 2009 initial scheduling conference.

by rule or statute but by the control necessarily vested in courts to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases." (citation omitted)), the Court agrees that dismissal without prejudice is warranted due to the plaintiff's failure to cooperate with the defendants and advance this matter to an ultimate resolution. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that the defendants' motion for dismissal is **GRANTED**, and this case is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

SO ORDERED this 29th day of May, 2009.

/s/
Reggie B. Walton
United States District Judge