2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JOSHUA ROBERTS, Case No.: 2:18-cv-00649-APG-NJK Plaintiff(s), **Order** [Docket Nos. 44, 45, 46] v. LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al., Defendant(s).

On January 7, 2019, the Court issued an order denying Plaintiff's requests for the United States Marshal Service to locate Defendant Devore to effectuate service, as well as other requests for alternative service, while also granting the request to extend the deadline to complete service to March 15, 2019. Docket No. 38. Plaintiff thereafter filed a motion to further extend that deadline, Docket No. 44, and a motion to reconsider, Docket No. 45. Plaintiff then filed a motion for the United States Marshal Service to effectuate service at an address he newly discovered for Defendant Devore. Docket No. 46. Defendants filed a response to the first two motions. Docket No. 50. Plaintiff filed a reply. Docket No. 52. The motions are properly resolved without a hearing. See Local Rule 78-1.

I. Docket No. 46 25

Beginning with Plaintiff's most recent motion, he has identified a new address at which he would like service attempted on Defendant Devore by the United States Marshal Service. Docket 28 No. 46. That motion is **GRANTED**.

5

14 15

16

17 II.

18

20

22

21

25 26

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

- Service must be effectuated on Defendant Devore within 60 days from the issuance of this order.
- The Clerk's Office shall deliver to the United States Marshal Service the summons for Officer Devore (Docket No. 18 at 1-2) and a copy of the amended complaint (Docket No. 17).
- The Clerk's Office shall mail Plaintiff a blank copy of the USM-285 form.
- Within 21 days of the issuance of this order, Plaintiff shall furnish the United States Marshal Service with the required USM-285 form for Defendant Devore.
- Within 21 days after receiving from the United States Marshal Service a copy of the USM-285 form showing whether service has been accomplished, Plaintiff must file a notice with the Court identifying whether Defendant Devore were served. If Plaintiff wishes to have service again attempted on Defendant Devore, a motion must be filed specifying a more detailed name and/or address for said defendant, or whether some other manner of service should be attempted.

Plaintiff also separately asks the Court to extend the time to effectuate service on Defendant Devore. Docket No. 44. In light of the order above providing that service shall be effectuated within 60 days of the issuance of this order, this motion to extend is hereby **DENIED** as moot.

III. Docket No. 45

Docket No. 44

Plaintiff lastly asks the Court to reconsider its prior ruling regarding service. Docket No. 45 at 2-4; see also Docket No. 38. As noted above, however, Plaintiff has since identified a location at which service may be attempted on Defendant Devore and the Court is allowing that

¹ Plaintiff has sought myriad relief through a single motion. See Docket Nos. 43, 44, 45. The Court does not address herein every aspect of that filing. If a request for relief included within that document is not addressed herein or in the order issued concurrently herewith, Plaintiff may file a separate motion issue that complies with the local rules. Moving forward, Plaintiff must file a separate motion for each type of relief he is seeking. See Local Rule IC 2-2(b).

service to be attempted by the United States Marshal Service. Accordingly, the motion for reconsideration is hereby **DENIED** as moot.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons explained more fully above, the motion for service (Docket No. 46) is **GRANTED**, the motion to extend time (Docket No. 44) is **DENIED** as moot, and the motion for reconsideration (Docket No. 45) is **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 12, 2019

Nancy J. Koppe United States Magistrate Judge