

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

**YASSIN MUHIDDIN AREF, *et al.*,**

**Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**ERIC HOLDER, *et al.*,**

**Defendants.**

**Civil Action No. 10-539 (BJR)**

**ORDER DISMISSING CASE**

This matter is before the Court upon a *sua sponte* review of the record. Because the Court finds that Plaintiff Royal Jones failed to comply with this Court's Order or otherwise prosecute his case, his claims are dismissed without prejudice.

Plaintiff Royal Jones, a federal prisoner, has brought suit against the Bureau of Prisons and various individuals. Plaintiff is no longer represented by his former counsel and previously indicated his desire to have the Court appoint counsel. The Court entered an Order on February 13, 2013, directing Plaintiff Jones to file an application *in forma pauperis*, or, alternatively, to provide notice to the Court of his intention to proceed pro se. *See* Order (Feb. 13, 2013). The Court warned Plaintiff Jones that failure to timely comply by March 1, 2013 would result in the dismissal of his claims. *Id.* On March 1, 2013, the Court extended Plaintiff Jones' time to comply till March 8, 2013, after he represented to chambers that the Clerk had mailed the February 13, 2013 order to an incorrect address. *See* Minute Order (Mar. 1, 2013). The Court reminded Plaintiff Jones that it was his responsibility to alert the Court of future address changes. Additionally, the Court ordered the Clerk to mail a copy of the Minute Order to Plaintiff Jones' updated address. *See* Minute Order (Mar. 1, 2013).

A district court has “inherent power to dismiss a case *sua sponte*” if a plaintiff fails to prosecute, comply with the rules, or with a court order. *Peterson v. Archstone Communities LLC*, 637 F.3d 416, 418 (D.C. Cir. 2011); *see also Link v. Wabash R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 633 (1962) (acknowledging a district court’s authority to dismiss a complaint for failure to prosecute).

The record reflects that Plaintiff Jones, although granted an extension until March 8, 2013, has not filed an *in forma pauperis* application nor in any way indicated his intent to prosecute this case pro se. Accordingly, the Court dismisses Plaintiff Royal Jones’ claims in this matter.

For the foregoing reasons, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff Royal Jones’ claims are **DISMISSED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

May 1, 2013



---

BARBARA J. ROTHSTEIN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE