1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
8	USSC HOLDINGS CORP., et al., ) 3:16-cv-00398-RCJ-WGC
9	Plaintiffs, ) ORDER REGARDING COURT ORDER
10	vs. (ECF No. 48) DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS/MOTION
11 12	TK PRODUCTS, LLC., et al., TO COMPEL (ECF No. 42)
	Defendants.
<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> <li>27</li> </ol>	On January 26, 2017, the court denied the motion of Defendants TK Products, LLC, Kurt O. Bauer and Trent Farrer (ECF No. 42) to hold Livespark, Inc., in contempt and to compel Livespark's compliance with a subpoena. Among the grounds the court cited for denying Defendants' motion (without prejudice) was the apparent failure of Defendants to have served Livespark with Defendants' motion. (ECF No. 48 at 1.) While the Certificate of Service accompanying Defendants' motion did not reflect service on Livespark (ECF No. 42 at 6; 1/6/2017), it has come to the court's attention that Defendants subsequently filed a "Proof of Service" on Livespark's resident agent, Nevada Legal Forms, Inc. (ECF No. 47, 1/18/2017.) The court overlooked the Proof of Service of the motion. Nevertheless, the conclusion reached in the court's order remains. The same rationale the court expressed in the order as to the questionable validity of the service of the underlying subpoena on Livespark's resident agent apply equally as well to the putative service of the motion, also on the resident agent. (Order, ECF No. 48, at 2-5.) ///

1	Accordingly, the court re-affirms its Order denying Defendants' Motion for Sanctions/Motion
2	to Compel (ECF No. 42).
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	DATED: January 31, 2017.
5	With G. Cobb
6	WILLIAM G. COBB UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
7	UNITED STATES MADISTRATE JUDGE
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
26	
27	
28	
	2