Id.

27

28

Here, Plaintiff has shown good cause to warrant an extension of the Rule 4(m) deadline. The Court therefore **GRANTS** Plaintiff a 120-day extension of time to effectuate service on Defendants and extends the Rule 4(m) deadline to August 3, 2016.

II. MOTION FOR SERVICE BY PUBLICATION

Service by publication implicates a defendant's fundamental due process rights. See, e.g., Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314-15 (1950); Price v. Dunn, 787 P.2d 785, 787 (Nev. 1990). As a result, service by publication is generally disfavored. See, e.g., Trustees of the Nev. Resort Assoc.—Int'l Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees & Moving Picture Machine Operators v. Alumifax, Inc., 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis. 106456, *2 (D. Nev. July 29, 2013).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(e)(1) provides for service "pursuant to the law of the state in which the district court is located, or in which service is effected." Under Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure ("NRCP") 4, parties are required to personally serve summons and the complaint upon defendants. When personal service proves impossible, however, NRCP 4(e)(1)(i) provides that a party may file a motion for service by publication when the opposing party "resides out of the state, or has departed from the state, or cannot, after due diligence be found within the state, or by concealment seeks to avoid the service of summons." When service of the summons is made by publication, the summons shall, in addition to any special statutory requirements, also contain a brief statement of the object of the action. NRCP 4(b).

A party moving for service by publication must seek leave of court by filing an affidavit demonstrating it diligently attempted to serve the defendant. There are several factors courts consider to evaluate a party's due diligence, including the number of attempts made to serve the defendant at his residence and other methods of locating defendants, such as consulting public directories and family members. *See Price*, 787 P.2d at 786-87; *Abreu v. Gilmer*, 985 P.2d 746, 747 (Nev. 1999); *McNair v. Rivera*, 874 P.2d 1240, 1241 (Nev. 1994).

In this case, Plaintiff has failed to establish the due diligence required to warrant service by publication. Attached to Plaintiff's motion are four affidavits of due diligence. Docket No. 15 at 5-13. Two of those affidavits, however, are duplicates. *See id.* Therefore, Plaintiff only offers evidence

indicating that it attempted service on Defendants twice. Further, Plaintiff fails to detail the methods that it used in attempting to locate Defendants.

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the Court hereby **GRANTS** Plaintiff's motion for extension of the 4(m) deadline. The deadline to effectuate service on Defendants is extended to August 3, 2016. Plaintiff's motion for service by publication is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 9, 2016

NANCY J KOPRE

United States Magistrate Judge