

General's Office seeking a waiver of service as to B. Hernandez. On February 9, 2010, this
Court issued an Order directing the United States Marshal Service ("USMS") to file a
Summons Returned Executed, a Summons Returned Unexecuted, a Waiver of Service
Returned Executed, or a status report as to the service of B. Hernandez.

5 On February 22, 2010, the Summons for B. Hernandez was returned unexecuted. The 6 return included a September 21, 2009, notation, "per KVSP not employed NO FWD 7 LOCATION[,]" an October 25, 2009, notation, "FWD TO CSP CORCORAN[,]" and a 8 February 1, 2010, notation, "waiver not ret'd, assigned personal svc, fwd fresno." The return 9 also includes a February 9, 2010, notation, "Refused by Anthony Lane (Lit coord)[;] says 10 person not at prison[.]"

11 On March 1, 2010, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause why this case should not 12 be dismissed without prejudice as to B. Hernandez pursuant to Rule 4(m), Fed.R.Civ.P., by 13 filing a writing with this Court on or before March 31, 2010. On March 24, 2010, Plaintiff 14 filed a response in which he asserted that he and the Court are being deceived by CSP-COR 15 officials asserting they have no forwarding address. On April 5, 2010, this Court ordered 16 counsel for co-defendants to provide under seal the last known address of Defendant B. 17 Hernandez if the information was known to him, in his possession, or under his control. 18 The Court has received and reviewed the May 5, 2010, correspondence from co-19 defendants' counsel. Counsel has informed the Court that he does not possess or have control over any information regarding the last known address of Defendant B. Hernandez.² 20 21 As the Court previously advised Plaintiff, service must be timely completed: 22

- If a defendant is not served within 120 days after the complaint is filed, the court on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period. . . .
- 25 Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m); *see also* December 17, 2009, Order [Doc. # 26]. "At a minimum, 'good
- 26

23

24

²Because this correspondence does not include any private information (e.g., address or employment information of B. Hernandez), the Court will direct the Clerk of the Court to file the correspondence.

1 cause' means excusable neglect." *Bourdette v. Barnette*, 923 F.2d 754, 756 (9th Cir.1991).

2 Service upon B. Hernandez has not been completed in the time set forth by the Court. 3 In this case, counsel for co-defendants has informed the Court that he does not possess or 4 control any information regarding the last known address of Defendant B. Hernandez. While 5 a pro se prisoner plaintiff is entitled to rely upon the USMS to effect proper service, see 6 Pruett v. Blandford, 912 F.2d 270, 275 (9th Cir.1990), it is a plaintiff's responsibility to 7 provide the USMS with the information necessary to identify each defendant to be served. 8 See Walker v. Sumner, 14 F.3d 1415, 1422 (9th Cir.1994), abrogated on other grounds, 9 Sandin v. Conner, 515 U.S. 472, 115 S.Ct. 2293, 132 L.Ed.2d 418 (1995). Plaintiff has 10 failed to provide the USMS with adequate information to effect timely service of process on 11 Defendant B. Hernandez.

While this Court has "broad discretion" to extend the time for service under Rule 4(m), even absent a showing of good cause, a court may consider various factors including prejudice to the defendant, actual notice, a possible limitations bar, and eventual service in determining whether to extend service. *Efaw v. Williams*, 473 F.3d 1038, 1040-1041 (9th Cir. 2007). Moreover, any such dismissal should be without prejudice. *See id.* at 772.

17 Here, the record shows no basis for again extending the time for service. Rather, the 18 record suggests that extending the time for service would be a futile act. Service on 19 Defendant B. Hernandez cannot be effected without more specific identifying information, 20 counsel for co-defendants does not have any information to facilitate service, and Plaintiff 21 has been unable to provide such information. Accordingly, dismissal without prejudice is 22 appropriate. Id.; see also Walker, 14 F.3d at 1422. Additionally, the Court has inherent 23 power to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases by dismissing actions for 24 failure to prosecute. See Link v. Wabash R. R., 370 U.S. 626, 629-30, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 8 25 L.Ed.2d 734 (1962).

26

27

28

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED:

1.Defendant B. Hernandez is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE from this
action pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m).

2. The Clerk of the Court shall file the May 5, 2010, correspondence. DATED this 11th day of May, 2010. Cing enson Cindy K. Jorgenson United States District Judge - 4 -