

1 Plaintiff responds that Defendants previously argued ACE was “the only [entity] even
2 potentially relevant to Plaintiff’s underlying lawsuit[.]” *See, e.g. Doc. # 8* at 3:13-14. Plaintiff also
3 represents the alleged action against ACE in Argentina was merely an unsuccessful attempt at
4 mediation. The Court finds that service to ACE via diplomatic channels will neither prejudice the
5 other Defendants nor delay rulings on their pending dispositive motions. Furthermore, after ACE is
6 served, personal jurisdiction and *forma non conveniens* defenses will still be available to
7 Defendants. Accordingly,

8 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants’ Joint Motion for Reconsideration of the
9 Order Granting Plaintiff’s Motion for Service of Process via Diplomatic Channels (#42) is **denied**.

10 DATED this 15th day of January, 2013.

11
12 
13 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
14 United States Magistrate Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28