

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
GEORGIA

Augusta Eventures, LLC v. Confirmed, LLC, d/b/a Confirmed 3602

Augusta Eventures · No. CV 126-004 · Decided February 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia denies Plaintiff Augusta Eventures, LLC’s request for the United States Marshals Service to effect service on Defendant. The Court explains that, because Plaintiff paid the filing fee and is not proceeding in forma pauperis, Plaintiff is responsible for service under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(c)(1), and no compelling reason exists to depart from the Court’s standard practice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia
DECIDED	February 3, 2026
DOCKET	CV 126-004
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for an order directing the United States Marshals Service to effect service of process on Defendant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

service of process civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure Service of process

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the district court should order the United States Marshals Service to effect service of process for a plaintiff who paid the filing fee and is not proceeding in forma pauperis.

HOLDINGS

1. A plaintiff who is not proceeding in forma pauperis and has paid the filing fee is responsible for service of process and is not entitled to service by the United States Marshals Service as a matter of right.
2. A generalized assertion of good cause, without a compelling reason to depart from the court's standard practice, does not warrant an order requiring the United States Marshals Service to effect service.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because Plaintiff is not proceeding IFP, having paid the \$405.00 filing fee, Plaintiff is responsible for service of process, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(1), and is not entitled to service by USMS.”

“Although Plaintiff makes the generalized assertion that good cause exists for service by USMS, the Court sees no compelling reason to vary its standard practice of requiring represented parties to effect service of process themselves rather than using the limited resources of USMS.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff paid the \$405.00 filing fee and was not proceeding in forma pauperis. Plaintiff requested that the United States Marshals Service serve Defendant and asserted generally that good cause supported the request, but identified no compelling reason for requiring Marshal service.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action after paying the filing fee and sought service by the United States Marshals Service. The district court denied the motion, concluding that Plaintiff was responsible for service because it was not proceeding in forma pauperis and had not shown a compelling reason to depart from the court's standard practice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Daker v. Ward, 2022 WL 17076984 (11th Cir. Nov. 18, 2022)

OPINION

Augusta Eventures, LLC v. Confirmed, LLC, d/b/a Confirmed 3602

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

AUGUSTA DIVISION

AUGUSTA EVENTURES, LLC,)

Plaintiff,

V. CV 126-004

CONFIRMED, LLC, d/b/a CONFIRMED 3602)

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff requests that the Court order the United States Marshals Service (“USMS”) to effect service on Defendant. (Doc. no. 13.) Because Plaintiff is not proceeding IFP, having paid the \$405.00 filing fee, Plaintiff is responsible for service of process, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(1), and is not entitled to service by USMS. Cf. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d). “When a plaintiff who is not proceeding IFP requests that a district court order that service be made by the USMS, the district court may grant such a request... .” *Daker v. Ward*, 2022 WL 17076984 (11th Cir. Nov. 18, 2022) (emphasis added); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3). Although Plaintiff makes the generalized assertion that good cause exists for service by USMS, the Court sees no compelling reason to vary its standard practice of requiring represented parties to effect service of process themselves rather than using the limited resources of USMS. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is DENIED. (Doc. no. 13.) SO ORDERED this 3rd day of February, 2026, at Augusta, Georgia.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA