



(requiring *pro se* litigants to notify the clerk of any change of address). Plaintiff failed to meet the deadline for filing an amended complaint and, since that time, has failed to provide a current address.

It is a long-established principle that this Court has the authority to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for a plaintiff's failure to prosecute his action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). "The authority of a federal trial court to dismiss a plaintiff's action . . . because of his failure to prosecute cannot seriously be doubted," and "is necessary in order to prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases and to avoid congestion in the calendars of the District Courts." *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629-30 (1962); see *Tower Ventures, Inc. v. City of Westfield*, 296 F.3d 43, 46 (1st Cir. 2002) ("Although dismissal ordinarily should be employed only when a plaintiff's misconduct is extreme, . . . disobedience of court orders, in and of itself, constitutes extreme misconduct (and, thus, warrants dismissal)[.]" (internal citation omitted) (citing *Cosme Nieves v. Deshler*, 826 F.2d 1, 2 (1st Cir. 1987))).

Dismissal is appropriate under the circumstances here. The Court is not required to delay disposition in this case until such time as plaintiff decides to provide the Court with his current address. Without plaintiff's active participation, the Court cannot effect the advancement of the case to a resolution on the merits.

Accordingly, for the failure to comply with this Court's directive and for the substantive reasons set forth in the November 21, 2017 memorandum and order, this action is hereby DISMISSED.

**So Ordered.**

Dated: February 26, 2018

/s/ F. Dennis Saylor IV  
F. Dennis Saylor IV  
United States District Judge