2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

17

18

19

21

FILED Priority Send Clsd APR - 7 2005 Enter **₫**\$\$\$\$5/JS-6 JS-2/JS-3 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY DEPUTY Scan Only ENTERED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT **APR** 8 2M5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA RICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 S.A. THOMAS and E.L. GIPSON,

Plaintiffs,

14 LEROY BACA, MICHAEL ANTONOVICH, YVONNE BURKE, 15 ll DEANE DANA, DON KNABE, GLORIA MOLINA, ZEV YAROSLAVSKY, 16

Defendants.

Case No. CV 04-08448 DDP (SHx)

ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND AMENDED MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION

[Motions filed on 12/17/04 and 3/21/05]

This matter is before the Court on the plaintiffs' motion for 20 class certification and their amended motion for class certification. It appears from the proof of service sheets 22 attached to these motions, as well as the comments made therein, that the plaintiffs' counsel failed to serve both of the 24 defendants' law firms. The plaintiffs' counsel contends that he is 25 ∥not required to serve both firms because Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(A) only 26 requires that "every paper . . . shall be served upon each of the (Reply at 8, n. \*\*.) However, the Court notes that when 28 | a defendant is sued in both his individual and official capacity,

> THIS CONSTITUTES NOTICE OF ENTRY AS REQUIRED BY FRCP, RULE 77(d).

## dase 2:04-cv-08448-DDP-SH Document 71 Filed 04/07/2005 Page 2 of 2

two different types of liability are implicated; therefore, in effect, two different parties are sued. One is the private person who may be personally liable and whose own funds may be at risk. The other is the public official who is actually a proxy for the public body for whom he works. Accordingly, because the plaintiffs' counsel failed to properly effect service, the Court denies the plaintiffs' motions without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4-7-05

DEAN D. PREGERSON

United States District Judge