**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

| | |
|---|---|
| CLARENCE B. HICKMAN, Sr., | No. 14-15517 |
| Plaintiff - Appellant, | D.C. No. 2:13-cv-02156-KJM-KJN |
| v. | |
| COUNTY OF BUTTE; et al., | MEMORANDUM[*] |
| Defendants - Appellees. | |

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Kimberly J. Mueller, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 18, 2014[**]

Before:    LEAVY, FISHER, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Clarence B. Hickman, Sr. appeals pro se from the district court's judgment

dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action without prejudice under Federal Rule of

Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to comply with a court order.  We review the

dismissal for an abuse of discretion, *Nevijel v. N. Coast Life Ins. Co.*, 651 F.2d 671,

---

[*]    This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

[**]    The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument.  *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

674 (9th Cir. 1981), and we affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Hickman's action following Hickman's failure to file an appropriate amendment, because the district court specifically warned Hickman that his action could be dismissed if he failed to file a compliant amended complaint. *See id.* at 673-74 (a complaint which fails to comply with Rule 8 may be dismissed under Rule 41(b)); *see also Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1262 (9th Cir. 1992) (discussing factors relevant for failure to comply with court order and explaining that, although dismissal is a harsh penalty, district court's dismissal should not be disturbed unless there is a "definite and firm conviction that the court below committed a clear error of judgment in the conclusion it reached upon a weighing of the relevant factors" (citations and internal quotation marks omitted)).

**AFFIRMED.**