

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

STEVEN STANDIFER,	)	8:12CV176
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>MEMORANDUM</b>
	)	<b>AND ORDER</b>
BROADMOOR DEVELOPMENT,	)	
Inc.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s Request to Enter Default and Default Judgment. (Filing No. [16](#).) Plaintiff requests that the court enter default judgment against Defendant because Defendant “failed to answer, plead or otherwise defend [his] complaint as directed.” (*Id.*) Defendant filed an Objection to Plaintiff’s request, noting that it received summons and the *original* Complaint, rather than the Amended Complaint, on October 11, 2012. (Filing No. [19](#).) Rather than object to service, Defendant filed its Answer on October 30, 2012. (*Id.*; Filing No. [15](#).)

Indeed, the court’s records show that the United States Marshal served Defendant by certified mail on October 11, 2012. (Filing No. [14](#).) Thus, in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12, Defendant had 21 days, or until November 1, 2012, in which to file its Answer. [Fed. R. Civ. P. 12\(a\)](#). Defendant met this deadline and, as such, default judgment is not warranted.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff’s Request to Enter Default and Default Judgment (filing no. [16](#)) is denied. Defendant’s Objection (filing no. [19](#)) to Plaintiff’s request is granted.

2. A separate progression order will be entered progressing this matter to final disposition.

DATED this 13th day of November, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

*s/ John M. Gerrard*

United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.