

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2021-094251

10/07/2021

HONORABLE STEPHEN M. HOPKINS

CLERK OF THE COURT
C. Avena
Deputy

GILA SPRINGS ASSOCIATION

KRISTOPHER L AMUNDSEN

v.

MICHAEL B CAMERON

JUDGE HOPKINS

MINUTE ENTRY

Plaintiff has requested service by alternative means pursuant to Rule 4.1 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 4.1 (k) provides as follows:

(k) Alternative Means of Service.

(1) *Generally.*

If a party shows that the means of service provided in Rule 4.1(c) through Rule 4.1(j) are impracticable, the court may--on motion and without notice to the person to be served--order that service may be accomplished in another manner.

(2) *Notice and Mailing.* If the court allows an alternative means of service, the serving party must make a reasonable effort to provide the person being served with actual notice of the action's commencement. In any event, the serving party must mail the summons, the pleading being served, and any court order authorizing an alternative means of service to the last-known business or residential address of the person being served.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2021-094251

10/07/2021

(3) *Service by Publication*. A party may serve by publication only if the requirements of Rule 4.1(l), 4.1(m), 4.2(f), or 4.2(g) are met and the procedures provided in those rules are followed.

Whether traditional service is “impractical,” defined as “extremely difficult or inconvenient” is a fact specific inquiry. *See Blair v. Burgener*, 226 Ariz. 213, 245 P.3d 898 (App. 2010). The Court finds in this case that personal is impractical.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED authorizing Plaintiff to serve Defendants at Defendants’ last known place of abode by posting this Order as well as the Summons and Complaint and any other related papers on the front door of Defendants’ last known residence address or on the front gate of Defendants’ property if unable to gain access to the front door.¹

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall also mail this Order as well as the Summons and Complaint and any other related papers by regular first class mail as provided in Rule 4.1 (k) of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall also e-mail this Order as well as the Summons and Complaint and any other related papers to Defendants at any e-mail address believed by Plaintiff to be associated with Defendants.²

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED extending the time to complete service to January 11, 2022.

The Court has granted an extension of time for Plaintiff to serve the Complaint and accompanying documents in this case which supersedes the original time computation for dismissal on the Inactive Calendar. Therefore,

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED placing this case on the Inactive Calendar for dismissal without further notice on January 12, 2022 unless an Affidavit of Service of Process is

¹ All of the orders for service shall be in addition to what has already been done, i.e., even if the Complaint was mailed before it must be mailed again, with a copy of this Order.

² *See generally Baidoo v. Blood-Dzraku*, 48 Misc. 3d 309, 310 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2015) (discussing service via e-mail or Facebook as supplemental methods of providing actual notice to a defendant of a pending legal proceeding); *see also generally Solving Sewer Service: Fighting Fraud With Technology*, Arkansas Law Review, Vol. 70, number 4 (2018); “*Hacking*” *Service of Process: Using Social Media to Provide Constitutionally Sufficient Notice of Process*, 38 U. Ark. Little Rock L. Rev. 559 (2016).

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2021-094251

10/07/2021

filed before that date indicating that Defendants have been served in accordance with the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure.