

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSE TRUJILLO,
Plaintiff,
v.
FERNANDO GONZALEZ,
Defendant.

Case No.17-cv-00137-HRL

**ORDER GRANTING
ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF FROM
SERVICE DEADLINE**

Re: Dkt. No. 14

United States District Court
Northern District of California

Plaintiff Jose Trujillo (“Trujillo”) requests that the court extend the deadline to complete service upon defendant Fernando Gonzalez (“Gonzalez”). Dkt. No. 14. The court set the current deadline of March 13, 2017, in its initial case management scheduling order. Dkt. No. 4.

In his administrative motion, Trujillo states that he has been diligently attempting to serve Gonzalez, the alleged owner of the subject property in this Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) denial of access case. Dkt. No. 14. Trujillo’s eight attempts to serve Gonzalez at what Trujillo initially believed to be Defendant’s home address (as identified through LexisNexis and Parcel Quest) were unsuccessful. Dkt. No. 14, Best Decl., ¶ 3. These attempts having failed, Trujillo then discovered another address for Gonzalez and attempted service there. *Id.*, ¶ 4-6. Gonzalez, Plaintiff asserts, is the CEO of the San Benito Community Services Development Corporation, and the new address is listed on a form related to that organization that was filed with the California Secretary of State. *Id.*, ¶ 4-6, Ex. C.

Trujillo claims that substitute service was completed on March 10, with the summons and complaint subsequently mailed on March 13, 2017. *Id.*, ¶ 7. Plaintiff argues that, under California law, service is effective as of March 23, 2017, ten days after the mailing was completed.¹ Plaintiff

¹ Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 415.20(b), if service cannot be completed in person through the exercise of reasonable diligence, a summons may be served via substitute


1 thus requests that the court extend the deadline to serve Defendant for 14 days to March 27, 2017.
2 Dkt. No. 14.

3 As the deadline for service in this case is determined by a court scheduling order rather
4 than Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4, Rule 16(b)(4) applies. This rule states: “[a] schedule may
5 be modified only for good cause and with the judge’s consent.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). Rule
6 16(b)’s good cause standard “primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking the
7 amendment.” *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992). Here,
8 Trujillo diligently attempted to serve Gonzalez at what Plaintiff reasonably thought was his home
9 address. Plaintiff attempted service eight times, including two three-hour stake-outs. After the
10 latter two attempts failed, Trujillo promptly located a new address for Gonzalez and promptly
11 attempted service at the new address.

12 The court is persuaded that Trujillo has been diligent in attempting to serve Gonzalez, and
13 that good cause exists to extend the deadline to complete service. The court extends the deadline
14 to complete service to March 27, 2017.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: 3/21/2017

17
18 
19 _____
20 HOWARD R. LLOYD
21 United States Magistrate Judge
22
23
24
25
26

27 service, and by mailing a copy of the summons and complaint to the address at which substitute
28 service was completed. Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 415.20(b). “Service of a summons in this manner
is deemed complete on the 10th day after the mailing.” *Id.*