

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

Richard Demurjian v. Christopher Henize et al.

Demurjian v. Henize, Civil No. 23-3180-BAH (D. Md. Feb. 26, 2026) · No. Civil No. 23-3180-BAH · Decided February 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Maryland denied without prejudice Richard Demurjian’s motion for alternative service on newly added defendants. The court held that Demurjian had not sufficiently demonstrated efforts to locate the defendants or attempted service at potential addresses, while granting an additional 30 days to effect service.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brendan A. Hurson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
DECIDED	February 27, 2026
DOCKET	Civil No. 23-3180-BAH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for alternative service of process on newly added defendants.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court evaluated whether the requested alternative method of service was authorized and reasonably calculated to provide actual notice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4 and Maryland Rule 2-121(c).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Richard Demurjian v. Christopher Henize, John Perry, Matthew Wright, Wade Ward, Cameron Burns

TOPICS

- service of process
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- service of process

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff had demonstrated that alternative service on the newly added defendants was appropriate under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4 and Maryland Rule 2-121(c).
2. Whether the court should extend the time for service on the newly added defendants.

HOLDINGS

1. Alternative service was not appropriate at this stage because the plaintiff had not sufficiently demonstrated diligent efforts to locate the defendants or attempted service under the applicable rules, including at the potential addresses he had identified.
2. The plaintiff was granted an additional 30 days from the date of the memorandum opinion and order to effect service on the newly added defendants.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Demurjian has not demonstrated that alternative service is appropriate yet.”

*“Accordingly, Demurjian’s motion for alternative service is **DENIED** without prejudice.”*

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The newly added defendants had been deposed and had identified their workplace at the Harford County Sheriff's Department as their address. Demurjian stated that he had been unable, despite due diligence, to locate their home addresses with certainty, although he had potential addresses. He had not attempted service at those potential addresses and had not shown efforts by a process server or other person to locate the defendants through public records or databases.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Demurjian filed a second amended complaint adding Christopher Henize, John Perry, Matthew Wright, Wade Ward, and Cameron Burns as defendants. He moved for alternative service by personal delivery to a responsible official at the defendants' workplace followed by first-class mail to the workplace. The court denied the motion without prejudice and allowed Demurjian an additional 30 days to effect service.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Hecker v. Gamer, Civ. No. 22-cv-2152-JMC, 2023 WL 1415957, at *1 (D. Md. Jan. 31, 2023)
- Fid Nat'l Title Ins. Co. v. M&R Title, Inc., Civ. No. 12-148-PWG, 2013 WL 12423808, at *2 (D. Md. Feb. 15, 2013)
- Wheelz Up, LLC v. Cordero, Civ. No. DKC 24-212, 2024 WL 2881349, at *1 (D. Md. June 7, 2024)

- Timilon Corp. v. Empowerment Just. Ctr. Corp., Civ. No. DKC-23-1134, 2023 WL 5671616, at *3 (D. Md. Sept. 1, 2023)
- Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Tr. Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950)
- Elmco Props., Inc. v. Second Nat'l Fed. Sav. Ass'n, 94 F.3d 914, 920-21 (4th Cir. 1996)
- Mosley v. W. Express, Inc., Civ. No. 25-2682-BAH, 2025 WL 2918441, at *2 (D. Md. Oct. 14, 2025)
- Wheelz Up, LLC v. Cordero, 2024 WL 3877627, at *3
- Grimes v. Carpenter Mgmt. Co., Civ. No. TJS-24-0552, 2024 WL 3455293, at *2 (D. Md. June 20, 2024)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-maryland/2026/richard-demurjian-v-christopher-henize-et-al-ijv3cl1c>