1	(Name)				
2	(Address)				
3	(CITY, STATE, ZIP)				
4	(TELEPHONE)				
5	Defendant Pro Se				
6	EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT				
7	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA				
8	Plaintiff,) Case No.:) Dept. No.:			
10	vs.)			
11	Defendant,) HEARING REQUESTED)			
12 13 14	1	OTION TO SET ASIDE DEFAULT AND AND WRIT PURSUANT THERETO AND			
15 16 17		IT'S REQUEST FOR AND/OR DISCOVERY RE SERVICE AND			
18 19	RULE 62 (b) MOTION TO STAY OF EXECUTION OF JUDGMENT PENDING <u>HEARING</u>				
20	Defendant,	, in proper person, pursuant to NRCP			
21	60(c), hereby moves the Court for an order v	vacating the Default and the Default Judgment			
22	entered herein for the reason that Defendant was never served with Summons and Complaint				
23	herein and based upon the authorities set for	th below. Defendant requests an evidentiary hearing			
25	on this matter to present evidence and to cro	ss examine the person who allegedly served			
26	Defendant with Summons and Complaint he	erein, and/or the opportunity to depose duces tecum			
27	the person who allegedly served Defendant	with Summons and Complaint. Defendant further			
28					

1	requests that the Writ of Execution and/or Writ of Garnishment entered herein be quashed, and					
2	that all wages garnished from Defendant, if any, be returned to Defendant, for the reasons set					
3	forth below. Defendant further respectfully requests pursuant to NRCP 62(b) that this Court					
4	stay the execution of said Judgment until such time as this motion can be heard.					
5	DATED this day of, 20					
6	Respectfully Submitted,					
7	Respectfully Submitted,					
8	Defendant <i>Pro Se</i>					
9						
10						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28	II					

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES I. BACKGROUND

The Complaint herein was filed on _______, 20_____. Return of

service of the summons and complaint was executed by					
stating that same were served on Defendant on, 20 at					
However, Defendant was never served with a summons and complaint. (See: Affidavit					
attached hereto). Default and Default Judgment were entered herein on					
20, when Defendant learned (his/her) wages were about to be garnished.					
Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 60(c) provides in pertinent part as follows:					
When a default judgment shall have been taken against any party who was not personally served with summons and complaint, either in the State of Nevada or in any other jurisdiction, and who has not entered a general appearance in the action, the court, after notice to the adverse party, upon motion made within 6 months after the date of service of written notice of entry of such judgment, may vacate such judgment and allow the party or the party's legal representatives to answer to the merits of the original action.					
The default judgment in this case must be vacated as the Defendant satisfies the Rule's					
requirements. Additionally, although a meritorious defense is not required, see Epstein v.					
Epstein, 950 P.2d 771 (Nev. 1997), Defendant has the following meritorious defense(s):					
Strong policy considerations exist in favor of a trial on the merits. <u>Price v</u> <u>Dunn</u> , 106 Nev. 100, 787 P.2d 785 (Nev. 1990).					
Page 3					

With conflicting affidavits before the Court concerning the crucial issue of service of process, the Court should set this matter for evidentiary hearing and/or give Defendant the opportunity to depose the process server as supported by the authorities cited below.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS REQUIRES NOTICE

It is axiomatic that notice of a lawsuit and opportunity to defend is fundamental due process of law as required by the Constitution.

An elementary and fundamental requirement of due process in any proceeding which is to be accorded finality is notice reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprize interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.

Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314, 94 L. Ed. 865, 70 S. Ct. 652 (1950). Further, personal service must be obtained in order for a court to exercise personal jurisdiction over a party; a judgment rendered without personal jurisdiction over a defendant is void. Community Ins. Co. v. Sullivan, 1997 Ohio App. LEXIS 2836 (Ohio Ct.App., 1997).

III. A HEARING IS REQUIRED

In *Casmey v. Smith*, 2004 Wash.App. LEXIS 2406 (Wash.App., 2004), the parties were involved in an automobile accident and the trial court entered a default judgment against appellant Smith. A Florida process server had provided a declaration of service stating that he personally served Smith on September 23, 1997 at 7:55 p.m. at 20837 Rain Dance Lane in Boca Raton by delivering to Smith copies of the summons and complaint. Smith provided a declaration denying personal service. The trial court denied Smith's motion without an evidentiary hearing. On appeal, the Court of Appeals of Washington vacated the judgment, stating that the conflicting declarations on whether Smith was personally served and thus subject to the jurisdiction of the courts required an evidentiary hearing to resolve the credibility of

witnesses on that point. The affidavits and conflicting declaration of service presented an issue of fact that could only be resolved by determining the credibility of the witnesses. The Court of Appeals of Washington said: "A court may abuse its discretion by failing to hold an evidentiary hearing when affidavits present an issue of fact whose resolution requires a determination of witness credibility." *Casmey, supra.*, 2004 Wash.App. LEXIS at *5.

In *Moore v. Baker*, 982 S.W.2d 286 (Mo.App., 1998), Baker was named as a defendant in a suit initiated by Moore after the parties were involved in a car accident. Service of process was made by leaving the papers at a fraternity house. According to a deputy sheriff's return, the deputy served Baker on August 24, 1997, at a fraternity house near the University of Missouri-Kansas City. A default judgment was entered, and Baker subsequently filed a motion to set aside the default judgment based on a claim of insufficient service of process, alleging that he did not live at the fraternity house on the alleged date of service. The circuit court overruled the motion to set aside without conducting an evidentiary hearing. The Missouri Court of Appeals found that the lower court erred in failing to conduct an evidentiary hearing on Baker's motion, saying:

When a party avers a *prima facie* basis under Rule 74.05(d) for setting aside a default judgment, the circuit court is obligated to convene an evidentiary hearing to give the moving party an opportunity to establish good cause. *Boatmen's First National Bank v. Krider*, 802 S.W.2d 531, 532 (Mo. App. 1991). Because the circuit court did not understand its obligation and summarily overruled Baker's motion without an evidentiary hearing, we remand the case to the circuit court so that it can convene a hearing to receive evidence concerning Baker's averments.

Moore, supra., 982 S.W.2d at 288. Accord: Stan Katz Real Estate, Inc. v. Chavez, 565 P.2d 1142, 1143 (Utah, 1977) (on issue involving service of process and whether defendant's usual place of abode was with his mother, the Supreme Court of Utah said "...when no depositions have been taken and disputed material facts are alleged in opposing affidavits, there should be an evidentiary hearing to aid in the resolution of those facts."); TCC Management, Inc. v. Clapp,

2.7

2005 Ohio 4357, 2005 OhioApp LEXIS 3946 (Ohio Ct.App., 2005) (hearing required on issue of validity of service of process); *Booker v. Greenville Gravel Co.*, 249 Ark. 330, 459 S.W.2d 408, 1970 Ark. LEXIS 1102 (Ark., 1970) (same).

IV. JUDICIAL OVERSIGHT IS NECESSARY IN VIEW OF KNOWN USE OF "SEWER SERVICE" AND THE "SUPERMAN" SYNDROME

In *New York City Housing Authority v. Fountain*, 172 Misc.2d 784, 660 N.Y.S.2d 247, 253 (N.Y.Civ.Ct., 1997), the court in stating its concern about "sewer service," footnoted the following:

The New York State Attorney-General and two City agencies have investigated service of process cases and found that 95% of the process servers reviewed had engaged in "sewer service", while 40% of the cases examined involved the "Superman" syndrome-process servers claiming three or more services at different locations at the exact same time. (A Joint Investigative Report Into the Practice of Sewer Service in New York City by the NYS Attorney General, NYC Dept of Consumer Affairs, & NYC Dept of Investigation, at 2 [Apr. 1986].) Further, they found that default judgments were entered in at least one out of every five cases of sewer service they uncovered. (*Ibid.*) Judges have recognized that questionable service practices occur. (*See, e.g., Leader House Assocs. v Reyes,* NYLJ, Feb. 16, 1983, at 13, col 3 [Civ Ct, NY County] [the court questioned the sufficiency of the service of process in 341 out of 524 default judgment applications].)

See also: U.S. v. Brand Jewelers, Inc., 318 F.Supp. 1293 (D.C.N.Y., 1970), granting injunction against a defendant who systematically was securing default judgments against economically disadvantaged people by using sewer service.

Further, Nevada Rule of Civil Procedure 62(b) states in pertinent part:

In its discretion and on such conditions for the security of the adverse party as are proper, the court may stay the execution of or any proceedings to enforce a judgment pending the disposition of a motion . . .relief from a judgment or order made pursuant to Rule 60. NRCP 62(b).

Pursuant to the terms of Rule 62(b), Defendant respectfully requests that the execution of the Judgment be stayed, pending the hearing for the motion, as the amount of money being withheld pursuant to the Writ, are beyond what the Defendant can reasonably afford, and are limiting the Defendant's overall ability to pay for life necessities. Thus, the Defendant requests a stay of execution pending the evidentiary hearing before this court.

CONCLUSION

Defendant is accordingly entitled to an order vacating the Default and the Default Judgment entered herein for the reason that Defendant was never served with Summons and Complaint herein. Defendant requests an evidentiary hearing on this matter to present evidence and to cross examine the person who allegedly served Defendant with Summons and Complaint herein, and/or the opportunity to depose *duces tecum* the person who allegedly served Defendant with Summons and Complaint herein. Defendant also requests the Execution of the Judgement be stayed pending the disposition of the Motion. Defendant further requests that the Writ of Execution and/or Writ of Garnishment entered herein be quashed, and that all wages garnished from Defendant, if any, be returned to Defendant.

DATED this	_ day of _	, 20
		Respectfully submitted,
		Signature
		Name
		Address
		Addicss
		Telephone Defendant <i>Pro Se</i>
		Detelluant Fro se

(NAME)	
(Address)	
(CITY, STATE, ZIP)	
(TELEPHONE) Defendant Pro Se	
EIGHTH J	UDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
CLAI	RK COUNTY, NEVADA
Plaintiff,) Case No.:) Dept. No.:
vs. Defendant,))
)
	AFFIDAVIT OF
The Affiant.	, being first duly sworn, testifies as follows
1. I was never served with	h a Summons and Complaint in the above-titled case.
2	
Further, the Affiant sayeth naug	ght.
STATE OF NEVADA) ss.	
COUNTY OF CLARK)	
This instrument was acknowledged be	fore me on
the day of	, 20
NOTARY PUBLIC in and for said cou	·
NOTARY PUBLIC in and for said cou	unty and state

1	(Name)						
2	(Address)						
3	(CITY, STATE, ZIP)						
4	(TELEPHONE)						
5	Defendant Pro Se						
6	EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT						
7	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA						
8							
9	Plaintiff,) Case No.:) Dept. No.:						
10	vs. Dept. No						
11	Defendant,						
12)						
13	CERTIFICATE OF U.S. MAILING						
14	I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the day of, 20, I placed a true						
15	and correct copy of the foregoing MOTION TO SET ASIDE DEFAULT AND DEFAULT						
16	JUDGMENT, AND TO STOP GARNISHMENT, AND REQUEST FOR EVIDENTIARY						
17	HEARING AND/OR DISCOVERY in the United States Mail in Las Vegas, Nevada with first-						
18	class postage prepaid, addressed to the following:						
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24	Defendant Pro Se						
25							
26							
27							
28	Page 9						