

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Masi L LC v. Seshat Bank, et al.

No. CV-25-02892-PHX-SPL, United States District Court for the District of Arizona (March 13, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona grants Plaintiff’s renewed motion for alternative service. The Court authorizes service by publication because Plaintiff was unable to locate valid physical, mailing, or electronic addresses for the defendants, and requires proof of service by publication by May 11, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Steven P. Logan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	March 13, 2026
DOCKET	CV-25-02892-PHX-SPL
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for alternative service after being unable to locate valid physical, mailing, or electronic addresses for the defendants.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the requirements governing personal jurisdiction and service of process, including whether the proposed alternative method was reasonably calculated to provide notice and an opportunity to present objections.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Masi L LC v. Seshat Bank, et al.

TOPICS

- service of process
- personal jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should authorize alternative service by publication after plaintiff was unable to locate valid physical, mailing, or electronic addresses for the defendants.
2. Whether the proposed alternative service method satisfied due process by being reasonably calculated to apprise the defendants of the action and provide them an opportunity to object.

HOLDINGS

1. Alternative service by publication was authorized because plaintiff demonstrated that conventional service was impracticable and the proposed method satisfied the applicable notice requirement.
2. Before a federal court may exercise personal jurisdiction over a defendant, the procedural requirement of service of summons must be satisfied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Before a federal court may exercise personal jurisdiction over a defendant, the procedural requirement of service of summons must be satisfied.” (at 1)

“Due process requires the Court to craft a method of service that is ‘reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.’” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff retained a licensed private investigator but was unable to find a valid address for either defendant. The email address previously used to communicate with the defendants was inactive, and plaintiff could not verify any physical, mailing, or electronic address for service. Plaintiff therefore sought to serve the defendants by publication.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Masi L LC filed the action in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona and sought renewed authorization to serve the defendants by publication. The court granted the renewed motion and set a deadline for filing proof of service by publication.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Omni Capital Int’l, Ltd. v. Rudolf Wolff & Co., 484 U.S. 97, 104 (1987)
- Amazon.com Inc. v. Peng, No. 2:23-cv-00607-TL-BAT, 2023 WL 5015398, at *3 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 7, 2023)
- Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314-15 (1950)

OPINION

Masi L LC v. Seshat Bank, et al.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8 Masi L LC,) No. CV-25-02892-PHX-SPL) 9) 10 Plaintiff,) ORDER vs.)) 11) Seshat Bank,
et al.,) 12) 13 Defendants.)) 14) 15 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for
Alternative Service 16 (Doc. 11). "Before a federal court may exercise personal jurisdiction over a
defendant, the 17 procedural requirement of service of summons must be satisfied." Omni Capital
Int'l, Ltd. 18 v. Rudolf Wolff & Co., 484 U.S. 97, 104 (1987), superseded by statute on other
grounds. 19 Service of an individual and business entity are governed by Federal Rules of Civil
20 Procedure 4(e) and 4(h), respectively. As Plaintiff notes, Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure
21 4.1(k) authorizes alternative means of service if service under 4.1(c) through 4.1(j) prove 22
impracticable. 23 "Due process requires the Court to craft a method of service that is 'reasonably
24 calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the 25
action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.'" Amazon.com Inc. v. 26 Peng,
No. 2:23-cv-00607-TL-BAT, 2023 WL 5015398, at *3 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 7, 2023) 27 (quoting
Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314-15 (1950) 28 (collecting cases)).
Here, Plaintiff has been unable to find a valid address for either 1 | Defendant despite retaining a
licensed private investigator. (Doc. 11 at 2, § 2). In addition, the email address Plaintiff previously
communicated with Defendant through is now 3 | inactive. (Doc. 11 at 2, 94] 3-5). Plaintiff has
therefore been unable to verify any physical, mailing, or electronic address to effect service. (Doc.
11 at 2, | 6). As a result, Plaintiff now seeks to serve Defendants by publication. Good cause
appearing, 6 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Motion for Alternative Service (Doc. 11) 1s
granted. 8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall have until May 11, 2026, to 9 |
complete and file proof of service by publication in accordance with Arizona Rule of Civil 10 |
Procedure 4.1(1). 11 Dated this 13th day of March, 2026. 13 Honorable even P. Lggan 14 United
States District udge 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28