resources assisting a litigant who will not help himself by submitting the documents required to initiate service of process in his case. Thus, both the first and second factors weigh in favor of dismissal.

Turning to the risk of prejudice, "pendency of a lawsuit is not sufficiently prejudicial in and of itself to warrant dismissal." <u>Id</u>. (citing <u>Yourish</u> at 991). However, "delay inherently increases the risk that witnesses' memories will fade and evidence will become stale," <u>id</u>., and it is Plaintiff's failure to return service documents to the court, in response to the Court's order, that is causing delay. Therefore, the third factor weighs in favor of dismissal.

As for the availability of lesser sanctions, at this stage in the proceedings there is little available to the Court which would constitute a satisfactory lesser sanction while protecting the Court from further unnecessary expenditure of its scarce resources. Plaintiff is proceeding in forma pauperis in this action, making monetary sanctions of little use, and given the early stage of these proceedings, the preclusion of evidence or witnesses is not available. However, inasmuch as the dismissal being considered in this case is without prejudice, the Court is stopping short of issuing the harshest possible sanction of dismissal with prejudice.

Finally, because public policy favors disposition on the merits, this factor will always weigh against dismissal. <u>Id</u>. at 643.

Accordingly, the court HEREBY RECOMMENDS that this action be dismissed, without prejudice, based on plaintiff's failure to obey the court's order of February 10, 2010.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within thirty days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>April 21, 2010</u> /s/ <u>Gary S. Austin</u>

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE