

again given fourteen (14) days to comply, and he was again advised that the failure to timely and fully comply with the Court's orders and instructions could result in the dismissal of this action. *See generally* Order, Mar. 3, 2022, ECF No. 4.

The time for compliance with the March 3, 2022 Order has now passed without a response from Plaintiff. Because Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's orders and instructions and otherwise failed to diligently prosecute his claims, this action is **DISMISSED without prejudice**. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41; *see also* *Brown v. Tallahassee Police Dep't*, 205 F. App'x 802, 802 (11th Cir. 2006) (per curiam) ("The court may dismiss an action *sua sponte* under Rule 41(b) for failure to prosecute or failure to obey a court order.") (citing *Lopez v. Aransas Cnty. Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 570 F.2d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 1978)).¹

SO ORDERED, this 22nd day of March, 2022.

s/C. Ashley Royal

C. ASHLEY ROYAL, SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

¹ In *Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206, 1209 (11th Cir. 1981) (en banc), the Eleventh Circuit adopted as binding precedent all decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to close of business on September 30, 1981.