

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**

CHRIS HAROLD CAVE,
Plaintiff,

vs.

CLARK COUNTY'S COMMISSION'S BOARD
INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 2:17-cv-00962-JAD-CWH
ORDER

Presently before the court is Defendant Clark County's Motion to Quash Service of Process (ECF No. 8), filed on May 10, 2017. Plaintiff Chris Harold Cave did not respond to the motion.


Defendant Clark County requests that the court quash service of process, arguing that Plaintiff's mailing of an unspecified document to a department of the county government does not constitute proper service of process under Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff did not respond to the motion, but given the unusual address¹ stated on the motion's certificate of service, it was unclear to the court whether Plaintiff received service of the motion. The court therefore ordered Defendant Clark County to serve a copy of its motion on Plaintiff at the address listed in the court's docket, which is 919 Linn Lane, Las Vegas, NV 89110. (Order (ECF No. 9).) Defendant Clark County filed an additional proof of service indicating that the motion was mailed to Plaintiff at the address on the docket sheet on June 13, 2017. Twenty-three days have passed since the motion was served on Plaintiff and he has not filed a response. *See* LR 7-2(b) (stating

¹ The certificate of service states that the motion was mailed to "U.S. ex rel., Chris-Harold, c/o 919 Linn Lance, near Non-resident, Las Vegas, Nevada State Republic, De jure Continental North America, Non Domestic, Not in a Territory District, Nor-Federal Zone, "ZIP" code exempt per: U.S.P.S. Dom Mail Man 122.32." (Mot. to Quash (ECF No. 8) at 4.)

1 that the deadline for filing responses to motions is 14 days after service of the motion.) The court
2 therefore will grant the motion on the grounds that it is unopposed. *See* LR 7-2(d) (stating that the
3 “failure of an opposing party to file points and authorities in response to any motion . . . constitutes
4 a consent to the granting of the motion”).

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant Clark County’s Motion to Quash Service of
6 Process (ECF No. 8) is GRANTED.

7
8 DATED: July 6, 2017

9
10 
11 _____
12 **C.W. Hoffman, Jr.**
13 **United States Magistrate Judge**
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28