Czasse 22:1199-cox-02200277-NWCIE-A/C	
	RETURN OF SERVICE
Service of the Summons and complaint was made by me (1	DATE January 3, 2020
NAME OF SERVER (PRINT) Maurice B. VerStandig	TITLE Attorney for the Plaintiffs
Check one box below to indicate appropriate me	
	No. of Physical Action 1
served personally upon the defenda	ant. Place where served:
Left copies thereof at the defendant discretion then residing therein.	t's dwelling house or usual place of bode with a person of suitable age and
☐ Name of person with whom the sur	mmons and complaint were left:
☐ Returned unexecuted:	
Other (specify) : (See attached supplemental statement)	
	STATEMENT OF SEDVICE FEES
TRAVEL SERVICE	STATEMENT OF SERVICE FEES TOTAL
	DECLARATION OF SERVER
I de alone un den menelten of meninen u	along the large of the Utility of Chatan of America the table for a circumstical
	nder the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing information Statement of Service Fees is true and correct.
Executed on January 3, 2020	/s/ Maurice B. VerStandig
Date	Signature of Server 9812 Falls Road, #114-160 Potomac, Maryland 20854
	Address of Server

VerStandig

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VERONICA BRILL, et al.

Plaintiffs,

MICHAEL L. POSTLE, et al.

Case No.: 2:19-cv-02027

SUPPLEMENT TO AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

- 1. My name is Maurice Belmont VerStandig, I am over the age of eighteen (18), and I am competent to testify to the matters set forth herein.
 - 2. I am counsel for the plaintiffs herein.
- 3. On Friday, January 3, 2020, at 9:21 pm local time, I approached the residence located at 3724 Deer Walk Way in Antelope, California (the "House"), where I understand Michael L. Postle ("Mr. Postle" or the "Defendant") to reside.
- 4. While at the House, I interchangeably knocked on the door and rang the door bell, announcing my presence, for a period of approximately eight (8) minutes, during which time I observed lights to be on the House, I observed a Lincoln MKX with California license plate 7UQU335 to be parked in the House's driveway, and I heard noises emanate from inside of the House.
- 5. After approximately eight (8) minutes, I retreated across the street to my personal vehicle, in which I remained with all lights turned off, and the engine turned off, so as to monitor activity in the House through its windows.

- 6. I then saw a male, meeting the description of the Defendant (whose description I know from viewing myriad photographs, viewing dozens of video recordings, and one personal meeting prior to this litigation), inside the House, standing atop the stairwell.
- 7. At this juncture, I returned to the door of the House, commenced to knock on the door and ring the doorbell interchangeably once again so as to announce my presence, and I witnessed movements through a window curtain and noises drawing nearer to the door upon which I was knocking.
- 8. At this time, I placed the summons and complaint in the above-referenced action between the security door and the front door of the House, calling out for the Defendant.
- 9. Upon returning to my car, I again witnessed movement inside the House, through windows affording a view of the upstairs portion of the House.
- 10. Prior to my serving the Defendant in this fashion, a local process server endeavored to serve the Defendant, at the House, on December 19, 22, 24, 29, and 30, to no avail.
- 11. Prior to my engaging a process server to attempt service at the House, I personally spoke with William Portanova ("Mr. Portanova"), a local attorney who has identified himself in the news media as representing the Defendant in connection with this matter, and asked him to accept service, to which he indicated he would confer with his client and get back to me, while also clarifying that he does *not* represent the Defendant in connection with a civil proceeding but, rather, is a criminal defense attorney.
- 12. On at least three occasions since, messages I have left for Mr. Portanova at his office have gone unreturned.



- 13. Based on Mr. Portanova's failure to respond to me after speaking with the Defendant, the professional process server's five (5) unsuccessful service attempts, the Defendant's failure to respond to a litigation hold letter he was sent by me prior to this suit being filed, the severity of the allegations lodged against the Defendant herein, the nature of one or more ongoing criminal investigations into the Defendant's behavior implicated herein, and the totality of the circumstances, I deduced the Defendant to be actively engaged in the avoidance of service.
- 14. As an attorney licensed to practice law in fourteen (14) federal courts and before the highest courts of five (5) states, I am familiar with the rules governing the evasion of service, the protocols for service of process in a federal suit, and the standards set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4.
- 15. Based on a review of governing case law, including the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit's opinion in *Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. of Am. v. Brenneke*, 551 F.3d 1132, 1134 (9th Cir. 2009), where a nearly-identical fact pattern is implicated and service is found to have been successfully made from the other side of a window, I do swear to the veracity of the facts set forth herein, upon my personal knowledge, and respectfully suggest the same to constitute good and valid service of process upon the Defendant.
 - 16. Further affiant sayeth naught.

