Smith et al v. Washington State et al

Doc. 72

cause why service was not made within that time. Ignorance of the rules is not good cause. *Townsel v. County of Contra Costa*, 820 F.2d 319, 320 (9th Cir.1987). Service on an address is meaningless if defendant does not receive the service. The standard of review is abuse of discretion, which indicates that a court has discretion in deciding if dismissal is proper. *Wei v. State of Hawaii*, 763 F.2d 370, 371 (9th Cir. 1985).

Plaintiffs have the duty to prosecute this action against defendant Denny and move the case forward. Here, there is no evidence that plaintiffs attempted to serve defendant Denny, or that defendant Denny is aware of the action. A court cannot exercise jurisdiction over a defendant without proper service of process. *See Omni Capital Int'l, Ltd. v. Rudolf Wolff & Co.*, 484 U.S. 97, 104 (1987); *Direct Mail Specialists, Inc. v. Eclat Computerized Techs., Inc.*, 840 F.2d 685, 688 (9th Cir.1988) ("A federal court does not have jurisdiction over a defendant unless the defendant has been served properly under Fed. R .Civ. P. 4").

Accordingly, the Court orders plaintiffs to perfect service on defendant Denny within 120 days of the filing of plaintiffs' third amended complaint (Dkt. 66), on or before September 28, 2015.

Dated this 6th day of August, 2015.

J. Richard Creatura

United States Magistrate Judge