UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRADY ARMSTRONG,

Plaintiff,

VS.

A. HEDGPETH, et al.,

Defendants.

1:11-cv-00761-LJO-GSA-PC

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISMISS CASE FOR FAILURE TO OBEY COURT ORDER (Doc. 59.)

OBJECTIONS, IF ANY, **DUE IN TWENTY** (20) **DAYS**

On August 25, 2014, the Court issued an order requiring Plaintiff to complete and submit service documents to the court within thirty days. (Doc. 59.) Plaintiff requested and was granted a thirty-day extension of time to submit the documents. (Docs. 60, 61.) The latest thirty day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not submitted service documents or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

In determining whether to dismiss this action for failure to comply with the directives set forth in its order, "the Court must weigh the following factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to defendants/respondents; (4) the availability of less drastic alternatives; and (5) the

public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits." <u>Pagtalunan v. Galaza</u>, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)).

"The public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation always favors dismissal," id. (quoting Yourish v. California Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 1999)), and here, the action has been pending since May 11, 2011. Plaintiff's failure to respond to the Court's order may reflect Plaintiff's disinterest in prosecuting this case. In such an instance, the Court cannot continue to expend its scarce resources assisting a litigant who will not help himself by defending his lawsuit. 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 submit documents to initiate service of process for his lawsuit 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 based on plaintiff's failure to obey the Court's order of August 25, 2014. 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 twenty (20) 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

Cir. 1991). IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: November 10, 2014	1	mendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time
TI IS SO ORDERED. Dated: November 10, 2014 Solution Value Valu	2	raive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th
TI IS SO ORDERED. Dated: November 10, 2014 S/ Gary S. Austin UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUNE 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	3	91).
Dated: November 10, 2014 /s/ Gary S. Austin UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUNITED STATES MAGISTRATE	- 11	
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JI UNITED STATES MA	5	SO ORDERED.
7 8 9 9 10 11 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	6	ted: November 10, 2014 /s/ Gary S. Austin
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	7	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	8	
11	9	
12	.0	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	.1	
14	.2	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	.3	
16	.4	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	.5	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	.6	
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	.7	
20 21 22 23 24 25	.8	
21 22 23 24 25	.9	
22 23 24 25	20	
23 24 25	21	
24 25	22	
24 25		
25		
II		
27		