

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 23 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

AARON L. STRIBLING, AKA Aaron
Lamont Stribling,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS AND
REHABILITATION; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 18-17314

D.C. No. 4:18-cv-03479-JSW

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Jeffrey S. White, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 21, 2019**

Before: THOMAS, Chief Judge, FRIEDLAND and BENNETT, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Aaron Stribling, AKA Aaron Lamont Stribling,
appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983
action alleging various constitutional violations. We have jurisdiction under 28

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

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

U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion a dismissal for failure to comply with a court order. *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing Stribling’s action because Stribling failed to file an amended complaint or to indicate that he intended to stand on the original complaint. *See Edwards v. Marin Park, Inc.*, 356 F.3d 1058, 1065 (9th Cir. 2004) (“The failure of the plaintiff eventually to respond to the court’s ultimatum—either by amending the complaint or by indicating to the court that it will not do so—is properly met with the sanction of a Rule 41(b) dismissal.”); *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61 (setting forth the five factors to be weighed when considering dismissal for failure to comply with a court order, and stating the district court is not required to make explicit findings, rather we may review the record independently).

AFFIRMED.