

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Kenneth Laverne Bounds, Jr. v. White Pine County, Officer Julian Fuentes #439, and Angela Yates

Bounds v. White Pine County · No. 3:25-cv-00403-MMD-CSD · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada granted White Pine County and Officer Julian Fuentes’s motion to quash service of process. The court held that Plaintiff had not established valid service under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4 and directed him to file proof of service or seek an extension within thirty days, warning that the defendants could otherwise be dismissed without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Craig S. Denney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-00403-MMD-CSD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	White Pine County and Officer Julian Fuentes specially appeared and moved to quash service of process. Plaintiff did not respond, and the court granted the motion both because the motion was unopposed under the local rules and because service was not substantially compliant with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court determined whether service complied substantially with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4 after Defendants challenged its validity; Plaintiff bore the burden of establishing valid service.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

[service of process](#) [personal jurisdiction](#) [civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the attempted service on White Pine County complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(j)(2) and Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 4.2(d)(3).
2. Whether the attempted service on Officer Julian Fuentes complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(e) and Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 4.2(d)(4).
3. Whether the court should quash the attempted service and allow additional time for Plaintiff to complete service or seek an extension under Rule 4(m).

HOLDINGS

1. A federal court lacks personal jurisdiction over a defendant unless the defendant has been served in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4, and actual notice or merely naming a defendant is insufficient without substantial compliance with Rule 4.
2. Plaintiff did not establish valid service on White Pine County or Officer Fuentes because leaving the summons and complaint with an administrative assistant at the Sheriff's Office did not demonstrate substantial compliance with the applicable service rules.
3. The motion to quash service of process filed by White Pine County and Officer Fuentes was granted.
4. Plaintiff was given thirty days from the date of the order to file proof of completed service or move for an extension of time; failure to comply could result in dismissal without prejudice of White Pine County and Officer Fuentes.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A federal court lacks “personal jurisdiction over a defendant unless the defendant has been served in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 4.”” (at 1)

“Although Rule 4 is flexible “so long as a party receives sufficient notice of the complaint, . . . neither actual notice nor simply naming the defendant in the complaint will provide personal jurisdiction without substantial compliance with Rule 4.”” (at 2)

“Plaintiff will have thirty (30) days from the date of this order to file proof of completed service of process on defendants White Pine County and Officer Fuentes or move for an extension of time to do so.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

An unidentified individual allegedly attempted to serve White Pine County and Officer Julian Fuentes on October 23, 2025, by leaving copies of the summons and complaint with an administrative assistant at the White Pine County Sheriff's Office. No summons return was filed, and Plaintiff did not establish that service complied substantially with the applicable federal and Nevada service rules.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the complaint on September 9, 2025. Defendants White Pine County and Officer Julian Fuentes challenged an attempted service in which an unidentified person allegedly left the summons and complaint with an administrative assistant at the White Pine County Sheriff's Office. The district court quashed the attempted service and allowed Plaintiff thirty days to file proof of service or seek an extension of time.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Benny v. Pipes, 799 F.2d 489, 492 (9th Cir. 1986), amended, 807 F.2d 1514 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Crowley v. Bannister, 734 F.3d 967, 974-75 (9th Cir. 2013)
- S.J. v. Issaquah School District No. 411, 470 F.3d 1288, 1293 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Brockmeyer v. May, 383 F.3d 798, 801 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Smith v. Dysart Unified School District, No. CV-25-03407-PHX-JZB, 2025 WL 3153441, at *2 (D. Ariz. Nov. 12, 2025)
- Lemoge v. United States, 587 F.3d 1188, 1198 (9th Cir. 2009)

OPINION

Kenneth Laverne Bounds, Jr. v. White Pine County, Officer Julian Fuentes #439, and Angela Yates
PER CURIAM.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 KENNETH LAVERNE BOUNDS, JR., Case No.: 3:25-cv-00403-MMD-CSD 4 Plaintiff Order
5 v. Re: ECF No. 10

6 WHITE PINE COUNTY, OFFICER JULIAN
FUENTES #439, and ANGELA YATES,

7 Defendants 8

9 Before the court is a motion to quash service of process filed by specially appearing 10
Defendants White Pine County and Officer Julian Fuentes. (ECF No. 10.) Plaintiff has not filed 11
any response, and the time for doing so has expired. For the reasons discussed below, the motion
12 will be granted. 13 Pursuant to the court’s local rules, the failure of a party to file points and
authorities in 14 response to any motion constitutes a consent to the granting of the motion. L.R.
7-2. On that 15 basis, the defendants’ motion may be granted. However, the motion is also
properly granted on 16 its merits.

17 I. STANDARD

18 A federal court lacks “personal jurisdiction over a defendant unless the defendant has 19 been
served in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 4.” Benny v. Pipes, 799 F.2d 489, 492 (9th Cir. 20 1986),
amended, 807 F.2d 1514 (9th Cir. 1987); see also Crowley v. Bannister, 734 F.3d 967, 21 974-75

(9th Cir. 2013). Service of process under Rule 4 includes serving a copy of both the summons and the complaint on the defendant. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(1). Under Rule 4(e), an individual defendant may be served by: 1 (1) following state law for serving a summons in an action brought in courts of general jurisdiction in the state where the district court is located or where service is made; or 2 (2) doing any of the following: 3 (A) delivering a copy of the summons and of the complaint to the individual personally; 4 (B) leaving a copy of each at the individual's dwelling or usual place of abode with someone of suitable age and discretion who resides there; or 5 (C) delivering a copy of each to an agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process. 6 Nevada law provides: 7 Any current or former public officer or employee of any county, city, town, or other political subdivision of the State, or any public entity of such a political subdivision, who is sued in his or her official capacity or his or her individual capacity for an act or omission relating to his or her public duties or employment 8 must be served by delivering a copy of the summons and complaint to the current or former public officer or employee, or an agent designated by him or her to 9 receive service of process. 10 Nev. R. Civ. P. 4.2(d)(4). 11 A state-created governmental organization subject to suit "must be served by: (A) 12 delivering a copy of the summons and of the complaint to its chief executive officer; or 13 (B) serving a copy of each in the manner prescribed by that state's law for serving a 14 summons or like process on such a defendant." R. 4(j)(2)(A),(B). Under Nev. R. Civ. P. 15 4.2(d)(3), 16 [a]ny county, city, town, or other political subdivision of the State, and any public entity of such a political subdivision, must be served by delivering a copy of the 17 summons and complaint to the presiding officer of the governing body of the political subdivision, or an agent designated by the presiding officer to receive 18 service of process. 19 1 "In addition to any other method which may be provided by statute or rule of court, 2 service [on a county] may be made upon the [county's] clerk or secretary." Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. 3 § 12.105. 4 Although Rule 4 is flexible "so long as a party receives sufficient notice of the complaint, 5 . . . neither actual notice nor simply naming the defendant in the complaint will provide personal 6 jurisdiction without substantial compliance with Rule 4." Benny, 799 F.2d at 492 (internal 7 citations and quotation marks omitted). Failure to effectuate service of process in compliance 8 with Rule 4 could result in the quashing of service of process or dismissal of all or part of this 9 action. See S.J. v. Issaquah Sch. Dist. No. 411, 470 F.3d 1288, 1293 (9th Cir. 2006). 10 Once service is challenged, a plaintiff bears the burden of establishing that service was 11 valid under Rule 4. Brockmeyer v. May, 383 F.3d 798, 801 (9th Cir. 2004); see also Smith v. 12 Dysart Unified Sch. Dist., No. CV-25-03407-PHX-JZB, 2025 WL 3153441, at *2 (D. Ariz. Nov. 13 12, 2025) ("The serving party—here, Plaintiff—'bears the burden of establishing the validity of 14 service.'" (internal citation omitted)).

15 II. DISCUSSION

16 Here, the county and Fuentes claim that an unidentified individual attempted service by 17 leaving a copy of the complaint and summons with an administrative assistant at the White Pine 18 County Sheriff's Office on October 23, 2025, and that such was not valid service for either 19

defendant.¹ Because no summons return has been filed with the court, defendants have 20 challenged the attempted service, and Plaintiff has not met his burden to establish that he has 21 1 Defendants' motion initially cites and relies upon a prior version of Nevada Rule of 22 Civil Procedure 4, before eventually citing the version of the rule currently in effect. (See ECF No. 10 at 2-3); see also Nev. R. Civ. P. 4.2 adv. comm. n. ("Rule 4.2(d) amends former NRCP 23 4(d)(5) and addresses service on government entities and their officers and employees."). 1 executed valid service of process on either defendant in substantial compliance with Rule 4 of 2 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the attempted service of process on White Pine County and 3 Fuentes will be quashed. 4 Plaintiff is advised that because the complaint was filed on September 9, 2025, service 5 was required to be completed no later than December 8, 2025. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) ("If a 6 defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court – on motion or on its 7 own after notice to the plaintiff – must dismiss the action without prejudice against that 8 defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good 9 cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period. . ."). 10 Accordingly, unless Plaintiff either files proof of service within thirty days of the date of this 11 order or moves for an extension of time to complete service upon a showing of good cause and 12 excusable neglect,² White Pine County and Officer Fuentes may be dismissed from this action 13 without prejudice. If service was not effectuated on or before December 8, 2025, good cause 14 must be shown for the failure to timely serve.

15 CONCLUSION

16 Accordingly, the motion to quash (ECF No. 10) is GRANTED. 17 Plaintiff will have thirty (30) days from the date of this order to file proof of completed 18 service of process on defendants White Pine County and Officer Fuentes or move for an 19 20 2 See *Lemoge v. United States*, 587 F.3d 1188, 1198 (9th Cir. 2009) (extension of time for service 21 under Rule 4(m) is mandatory where good cause is shown, and may be granted on a showing of excusable neglect); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(B) ("When an act may or must be done within a 22 specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time . . . on motion made after the time has expired if the party failed to act because of excusable neglect."); L.R. IA 6-1(a) (" A request 23 made after the expiration of the specified period will not be granted unless the movant or attorney demonstrates that the failure to file the motion before the deadline expired was the result of excusable neglect."). extension of time to do so. Should Plaintiff fail to timely comply, White Pine County and Officer Fuentes may be dismissed from this action without prejudice. 3) IT IS SO ORDERED. 4 Dated: January 8, 2026 . CS or Craig S. Denney 7 United States Magistfate Judge 8 9 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23