

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

## Ferrari Financial Services, Inc. v. Gueorgui Gantchev

Ferrari Financial Services · No. 2:25-cv-01720-CDS-MDC · Decided January 8, 2026

### SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada granted in part Ferrari Financial Services, Inc.'s motion for alternative service and authorized service of Gueorgui Gantchev by email. The court denied the request for service by publication as moot and granted a motion extending the deadline to file proof of service through February 9, 2026.

### CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the District of Nevada                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Maximiliano D. Couvillier, III                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the District of Nevada                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| DECIDED               | January 8, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| DOCKET                | 2:25-cv-01720-CDS-MDC                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Plaintiff moved for authorization to serve defendant by email or, alternatively, by publication, and moved for an extension of time to effect service. The district court granted alternative service by email, denied the request for service by publication as moot, and granted the extension motion. |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | The court applied its discretion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) and Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 4.4 to determine whether alternative service was impracticable, comported with due process, and whether good cause supported an extension of time.                                        |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished, nonprecedential district-court order                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

### TOPICS

[service of process](#) [civil procedure](#) [breach of contract](#) [commercial litigation](#)

### PRACTICE AREAS

[civil procedure](#) [contracts](#) [commercial litigation](#)

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff demonstrated that the ordinary methods of service were impracticable under Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 4.4.
2. Whether service of the summons and complaint by email to the two identified addresses was reasonably calculated to provide defendant notice and an opportunity to respond.
3. Whether plaintiff showed good cause for extending the time to serve defendant under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m).
4. Whether service by publication should be authorized as an alternative to email service.

## HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff demonstrated that service under the ordinary Nevada service methods was impracticable because repeated personal-service attempts and additional efforts to locate defendant had failed.
2. Service by email to [lvcars2445@gmail.com](mailto:lvcars2445@gmail.com) and [gueorgig@gmail.com](mailto:gueorgig@gmail.com) was authorized because it was reasonably calculated to give Gantchev notice of the action and an opportunity to respond.
3. Plaintiff showed good cause for extending the time to serve Gantchev, and the court extended the deadline to February 9, 2026.
4. The request for service by publication was denied as moot because the court authorized service by email; plaintiff could renew the request if email service failed.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“the Constitution does not require any particular means of service of process.”* (at 1-2)

*“An alternative method of service comports with due process so long as it 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 3)

*“Plaintiff may attempt to serve Gantchev by email to addresses [lvcars2445@gmail.com](mailto:lvcars2445@gmail.com) and [gueorgig@gmail.com](mailto:gueorgig@gmail.com).”* (at 5)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action arises from Gantchev's alleged failure to make required contractual payments. Plaintiff made several attempts to personally serve Gantchev at his last-known work and home locations, conducted skip traces and a public-records search, and attempted to communicate with him by email. Gantchev responded from one of the proposed email addresses, and plaintiff's counsel received no kickback or other indication that emails to either address were undeliverable.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ferrari Financial Services, Inc. filed a contract action against Gueorgui Gantchev and attempted personal service at his last-known work and home locations. After conducting skip traces and a public-records search, plaintiff

sought alternative service and additional time to serve. The court granted service by email and extended the service deadline to February 9, 2026.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- Rio Props. v. Rio Int'l Interlink, 284 F.3d 1007, 1017 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314, 70 S. Ct. 652, 94 L. Ed. 865 (1950)
- Neumont University, LLC v. Nickles, 304 F.R.D. 594, 599 (D. Nev. 2015)
- Efaw v. Williams, 473 D.3d 1038, 1041 (9th Cir.)
- Henderson v. United States, 517 U.S. 654, 661, 116 S. Ct. 1638, 134 L. Ed. 2d 880 (1996)
- PlayUp, Inc. v. Mintas, No. 2:21-cv-02129-GMN-NJK, 2021 WL 5988539, at \*2 (D. Nev. Dec. 16, 2021)
- Starken v. Amazon.com, Inc., No. 2:25-cv-0045-RFB-EJY, 2025 WL 1640794, at \*1-2 (D. Nev. May 5, 2025)
- Townsel v. Contra Costa County, Cal., 820 F.2d 319, 320 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985)
- Martinez v. Yist, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991)
- Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983)