I.

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 8, 2014, a motor vehicle collision occurred at the intersection of Cheyenne Avenue and Rainbow Boulevard in Clark County, Nevada involving Plaintiff

27

28

23

24

25



Debbie Siegfried ("Siegfried") and Defendant Jess Lopez. As the result of the collision, Siegfried suffered injuries and filed a personal injury action in State Court.

On February 10, 2020, a jury trial commenced in the personal injury action. During the jury selection process, the parties, through their respective counsel, agreed to submit the case to binding arbitration. Up to and during the course of the trial, Defendant Loya Insurance Company refused to settle the case to prevent a judgment in excess of the policy limits against its insured, Defendant Lopez. Under the terms and conditions of the Binding Arbitration Agreement, Defendant Lopez assigned all his legal rights against Defendant Loya Insurance Company for the breach of duties described herein. Siegfried, as Lopez's assignee, has the legal right to bring the claims asserted against Defendant Loya Insurance Company herein.

The Complaint in this matter was filed on September 3, 2020. Plaintiff Debbie Siegfried (hereinafter "Plaintiff") has 120 days to serve Defendants with a copy of the Summons and Complaint. The deadline to effect service of process upon Defendants is January 1, 2021. Defendant Loya Insurance Company was already served.

After numerous unsuccessful attempts to personally serve Defendant Jess Lopez, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this court enter an order allowing Plaintiff to serve Defendant Lopez by publication. The attempts to personally serve Defendant Lopez are outlined below:

- On or around September 4, 2020 Plaintiff retained LV Process and Investigations, LLC (hereinafter "LV Process") serve Defendant Lopez with the Summons and Complaint.
- On or around September 8, 2020, LV Process attempted to serve Defendant



Lopez at his residence located at 8744 Raindrop Canyon Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada 89129. There was no answer to a knock on the door and no vehicles present. A business card was left on the front door.

- On or around September 12, 16, and 21, 2020, LV Process again attempted
 to service Defendant Lopez at his residence located at 8744 Raindrop
 Canyon Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada 89129. A Nissan Sentra was in the
 driveway but no one answered the door. A business car was left on the
 front door requesting contact.
- On or around September 21, 2020, LV Process ran a Database Tracers search on the Nissan Sentra and found the vehicle was owned by Defendant Lopez. LV Process also received a copy of the traffic accident report and attempted to contact Defendant Lopez by phone.
- On September 24 and 29, 2020 and October 3, 2020, LV Process again attempted to service Defendant Lopez at his residence located at 8744
 Raindrop Canyon Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada 89129. The Nissan Sentra was in the driveway, but no one answered the door. A business car was left on the front door requesting contact.
- On September 28, 2020 and October 5, 2020, LV Process tried to contact
 Defendant Lopez by phone but was unsuccessful.
- On October 5, 2020, LV Process ran multiple database searches, including but not limited to: Database Tracers Clark County Assessor's website, Nevada Voters Registration, Clark County Detention Center, Clark County Marriage Records, Nevada Secretary of State, Clark County Justice and



District Courts in Las Vegas and Henderson and an online search, but found no current information on Defendant Lopez.

 On October 5, 2020, LV Process again tried to contact Defendant Lopez by phone but was unsuccessful.

II.

LEGAL ARGUMENT

FRCP 4(m) states, in pertinent part, as follows:

(m) TIME LIMIT FOR SERVICE. If a defendant is not served within 90 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.

Pursuant to FRCP 4(m), Siegfried seeks an order to enlarge the time to serve Defendant Lopez. Siegfried has also filed, concurrently herewith, a Motion to Serve by Publication wherein she seeks to serve Defendant Lopez by publication, but requires additional time to effectuate said service. Based on the filing of the Complaint, Siegfried currently has up to and including January 1, 2021, to effectuate service of process on Defendant Lopez. Siegfried requests an additional 90 days, up to and including April 1, 2021 to serve the Defendant Lopez via publication. This is Siegfried's first request for an extension of time.

∦..

 $24 \parallel \dots$

 $25 \parallel \dots$

27 || · · ·

28 ∥⋯



III. 1 2 **CONCLUSION** 3 For the foregoing reasons, Siegfired respectfully requests this Court enter an 4 Order granting Plaintiff Debbie Siegfried's Motion to Enlarge Time to Serve, to allow 5 Siegfried up to and including April 1, 2021, to effectuate service of process on Defendant 6 7 Lopez. 8 DATED this __ day of December, 2020. 9 Respectfully Submitted, 10 PRINCE LAW GROUP 11 12 Nevada Bar No. 5092 13 KEVIN T. STRONG Nevada Bar No. 12107 14 10801 West Charleston Boulevard 15 Suite 560 Las Vegas, Nevada 89135 16 Tel: (702) 534-7600 17 Fax: (702) 534-7601 Attorneys for Plaintiff 18 Debbie Siegfried 19 20 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 DATED: December 8, 2020 23 24 DANIEL J. ALBREGTS 25 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 26 27



following:

Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of PRINCE LAW

GROUP and that on the _____ day of December, 2020, I electronically filed the foregoing

document entitled PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO ENLARGE TIME TO SERVE

SUMMOND AND COMPLAINT ON DEFENDANT JESS LOPEZ with the Clerk of

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

the Court using the CM/ECF system, which sent a notice of electronic filing to the

M. Bradley Johnson, Esq.

Kravitz, Schnitzer & Johnson

8985 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 200

Las Vegas, NV 89123

Attorneys for Defendant

Loya Insurance Company

An Employee of Prince Law Group