| 1 | | |
|----------|---|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 5 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA | |
| 6 | * * * | |
| 7 | STEELMAN PARTNERS, LLP, <i>et al.</i> , Case No. 2:12-cv-00198-MMD-CWH | |
| 8 | Plaintiff, ORDER | |
| 9 | SANUM INVESTMENTS, LTD, <i>et al.</i> , | |
| 10 | Defendants. | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | Before the Court is Plaintiff's Application for Entry of Default on Defendant Fong | |
| 13 | Keng Van Property Investment Company (dkt. no. 40) ("Application"), seeking the | |
| 14 | Clerks' entry of default against the sole remaining defendant Fong Keng Van Property | |
| 15 | Investment Company Limited ("FKV"). Plaintiff contends that FKV was properly served | |
| 16 | with the Summons and Complaint, and that FKV has failed to appear. Counsel's | |
| 17 | supporting affidavit refers to the Affidavit of Service as Exhibit 1. (Dkt. no. 40 at 3.) Filed | |
| 18 | separately (dkt. no. 42), Exhibit 1 reproduces the Proof of Service on FKV that Plaintiff filed with the Court on June 6, 2012, which shows that the Summons purportedly served | |
| 19 | on FKV was issued to Jade Entertainment Group Ltd., not FKV. (Dkt. no. 42.) The | |
| 20 | Summons does not identify FKV on its face. (<i>Id.</i>) Plaintiff thus has failed to offer | |
| 21 22 | sufficient proof of service of process on FKV. Plaintiff's Application is therefore denied. | |
| 22 | Plaintiff has thirty (30) days to cure the deficiency with respect to service of | |
| 23 24 | process on FKV. Failure to do so will result in dismissal of FKV for failure to timely file | |
| 24 25 | proof of service of process pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). | |
| 26 | DATED THIS 16 th day of July 2014. | |
| 20 | | |
| 28 | MIRANDA M. DU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE | |
| | | |
| | | |

Dockets.Justia.com