

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**

JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.,
Plaintiff(s),
v.
SFR INVESTMENTS POOL 1, LLC, et al.,
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-cv-00329-JCM-NJK
ORDER
(Docket Nos. 46, 47, 49)

Pending before the Court are SFR’s motions to extend the time for service and motion to serve by publication. Docket Nos. 46, 47, 49. With respect to extending the deadline to effectuate service, SFR cites only the Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure and state case law. SFR has failed to cite any legal authority or provide any explanation as to why such a deadline in federal court is governed by state law.¹ Accordingly, the pending motions are **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED: October 3, 2017



NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ The only federal legal authority provided in the motions is a block quotation of Rule 4(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which provides that the *manner of service* may be in accordance with state law.