

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ROBIN M. LEE,

Plaintiff,

v.

PETER HO, et al.,

Defendants.

2:12-CV-884 JCM (GWF)

ORDER

Presently before the court is plaintiff Robin M. Lee’s motions for default judgment. Docs. #4 and #7. The defendants have not responded.

Default judgment is appropriate “when a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend, and that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise. . .” Fed. R. Civ. P. 55. Obtaining a default judgment entails two steps: “first, the party seeking a default judgment must file a motion for entry of default with the clerk of a district court by demonstrating that the opposing party has failed to answer or otherwise respond to the complaint, and, second, once the clerk has entered a default, the moving party may then seek entry of a default judgment against the defaulting party.” See *UMG Recordings, Inc. v. Stewart*, 461 F. Supp. 2d 837, 840 (S.D. Ill. 2006). Where a party has not been properly served, there is not basis for a court to enter default judgment. See *Fairly v. Potter*, 2003 WL 402261, *4 (N.D. Cal. 2003).

Here, plaintiff Lee has not filed for entry of clerk’s default. Accordingly, the motion for default judgment should be denied as premature. Moreover, the record before this court does not

1 reflect that any of the defendants have been served. As such, there is no basis for the entry of default
2 judgment.

3 Accordingly,

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff's motions for
5 default judgment (docs. #4 and #7) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

6 DATED June 26, 2012.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE