

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND (Northern Division)**

BRENDA LEE COLEMAN :  
507 Bowleys Quarters Road, Apt. B :  
Middle River, Maryland 21220 :

Plaintiff, :

v. : Civil No.:

DAVOL, INC. :  
100 Crossings Boulevard :  
Providence, Rhode Island 02886 :

SERVE: Resident Agent/Owner: :  
CT Corporation System :  
10 Weybosset Street :  
Providence, Rhode Island 02903 :

AND :

C.R. BARD, INC. :  
730 Central Avenue :  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974 :

SERVE: Resident Agent/Owner: :  
Jean F. Holloway :  
730 Central Avenue :  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974 :

Defendants. :

**COMPLAINT AND ELECTION FOR JURY TRIAL**

COMES NOW the Plaintiff, BRENDA LEE COLEMAN, by her attorneys, Andrew N. Sindler, and the LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW N. SINDLER, LLC, and hereby sues Defendants, DAVOL, INC., and C.R. BARD, INC., and states as follows:

1. Plaintiff is over eighteen (18) years of age, and is and was, at all time relevant hereto, a resident of Middle River, Baltimore County, Maryland.

2. Defendant DAVOL, INC., (hereinafter “DAVOL”) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of a state other than the State of Maryland, having its principal place of business in Rhode Island, but which is, and at all times pertinent hereto was, doing business in the State of Maryland.

3. Defendant C.R. BARD, INC., (hereinafter “BARD”) is the parent company of Defendant DAVOL and Defendant BARD and is a foreign corporation having its principal place of business in New Jersey, but which is, and at all times pertinent hereto was, doing business in the State of Maryland. Defendants have a registered agent in the states of their principal places of business, and in the State of Maryland.

4. This court has jurisdiction in this matter in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §1332 based on diversity of citizenship, and the amount in controversy which exceeds Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000.00).

5. This court has venue in this matter in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §1391.

**COUNT I**  
**Negligence**

6. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 6 as though they were fully restated herein.

7. At all times material hereto, Defendants, DAVOL and BARD, were in the business of developing, manufacturing and marketing medical devices for hernia surgery, including, but not limited to, the product known as Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patches.

8. On or about December 31, 2013, a surgeon, Dr. Roger Filamore, performed hernia repair surgery on the Plaintiff at Franklin Square Hospital Center in

Baltimore, MD, and implanted a Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch manufactured by Defendants DAVOL and BARD, and sold by the Defendants to Franklin Square Hospital Center for the purpose of hernia surgery, such as the surgery performed on the Plaintiff on or about December 31, 2013.

9. The Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch used on the Plaintiff has caused reported complications in a number of patients and other similar mesh products were recalled by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in or around December 2005 and 2006, due to the continual failure and adverse health effects associated with these mesh products. This was unknown to the Plaintiff at the time of the surgery on December 31, 2013.

10. Following the December 31, 2013, surgery, the Plaintiff continued to have significant pain and discomfort in her abdominal area, and other complications which have included, but are not limited to, swelling and dropping on the right side, and frequent bowel effects including increased urges which have caused uncontrollable accidents, all of which has required continued treatment. Plaintiff has likely suffered further adverse effects which have not been able to be diagnosed to date due to lack of funds and adequate insurance, but she will likely require significant treatment in the future, including additional surgery to remove the recalled mesh patch and treat future complications.

11. As a result of problems associated with Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch, the Plaintiff endured a significant period of pain and discomfort that resulted in multiple hospitalizations and will likely require substantial future treatment, including subsequent

surgery to remove the mesh, and the Plaintiff continues and will continue to suffer with pain and discomfort, and the risk of infection in the future.

12. The failure of the Defendants' Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch that was placed in the abdomen and intestinal wall of the Plaintiff on December 31, 2013, was the direct and proximate result of the negligence, carelessness and recklessness of the Defendants in the following particulars:

a. in designing, manufacturing and providing a medical device of such construction that it could fail for multiple reasons, including its inability to repair a hernia without adverse health effects and complications;

b. in failing to provide proper and clear warning of the dangers that the medical device (Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch) might fail by not working as advertised and intended, causing the need for further surgery and other injuries and damages to the patient;

c. in manufacturing and providing a hernia mesh patch that was manufactured improperly, and did not operate to repair a hernia without adverse health effects and complications;

d. in failing to use available design and engineering skill or knowledge to produce a hernia mesh patch that would properly repair a hernia without adverse health effects and complications;

e. in failing to provide adequate operating instructions and warnings to the surgeons who used the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch even though the Defendants knew or should have known that such warnings were necessary for the safe use of the

hernia mesh patch;

f. in failing to adequately inspect and test the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch for safety prior to offering it for sale;

g. in failing to discover that the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch was dangerously defective, improperly designed and manufactured, inadequately tested and inspected, entirely unfit for duty and unsafe for use, constituting a hazard for the patient to whom the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch was placed;

h. in failing to remove the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch from the market, including the one used on the Plaintiff, after the FDA had ordered its recall; and

i. in such other and further respects to be proved at trial.

13. As a direct and proximate result of receiving the Defendants' Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch, the Plaintiff suffered the loss of her former state of physical and mental well being, and suffered serious injuries to her body, was seriously and permanently injured and has required medical care and attention, including additional surgery, additional hospital admission, additional physical therapy, and will continue to require medical care and attention; she has suffered and will continue to suffer great mental anguish, severe chronic pain and agony as a result of the happening of the occurrence; she has incurred and will continue to incur lost wages and earnings as a result of the happening of the occurrence; and is permanently disabled as a result of the happening of the occurrence, and was otherwise injured and damaged.

14. No negligence on the part of the Plaintiff contributed to the happening of the occurrence in any way hereto.

15. The Plaintiff's injuries and damages as recited herein, occurred directly as a result of and were proximately caused by the negligence of the Defendants as described herein.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, BRENDA LEE COLEMAN claims the sum of Ten Million Dollars (\$10,000,000.00) in compensatory and punitive damages from the Defendants, DAVOL, INC., and C.R. BARD, INC., and each of them, plus interest and costs.

## **COUNT II**

### **Strict Liability**

16. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 15 as though they were fully restated herein.

17. At all times material hereto, Defendants, DAVOL and BARD, were in the business of developing, manufacturing and marketing medical devices for hernia surgery, including, but not limited to, Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch.

18. The Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch in question was manufactured, sold and placed into the stream of commerce by the Defendants, DAVOL and BARD, in an unsafe and defective condition and the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch in question was unreasonably dangerous to its users by reason of, among others, the following defects in its design, manufacture, testing and/or marketing:

a. in designing, manufacturing and providing a medical device of such construction that it could fail for multiple reasons, including its inability to repair a hernia without adverse health effects and complications;

b. in failing to provide proper and clear warning of the dangers that the medical device (Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch) might fail by not working as advertised and intended, causing the need for further surgery and other injuries and damages to the patient;

c. in manufacturing and providing a hernia mesh patch that was manufactured improperly, and did not operate to repair a hernia without adverse health effects and complications;

d. in failing to use available design and engineering skill or knowledge to produce a hernia mesh patch that would properly repair a hernia without adverse health effects and complications;

e. in failing to provide adequate operating instructions and warnings to the surgeons who used the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch even though the Defendants knew or should have known that such warnings were necessary for the safe use of the hernia mesh patch;

f. in failing to adequately inspect and test the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch for safety prior to offering it for sale;

g. in failing to discover that the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch was dangerously defective, improperly designed and manufactured, inadequately tested and inspected, entirely unfit for duty and unsafe for use, constituting a hazard for the patient to whom the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch was placed;

h. in failing to remove the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch from the market, including the one used on the Plaintiff, after the FDA had ordered its recall; and

i. in such other and further respects to be proved at trial.

19. The Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch manufactured by the Defendants, DAVOL and BARD, was sold and placed into the stream of commerce by the Defendants and reached the patient without substantial change in its design or structure.

20. Defendants are strictly liable to Plaintiff by reason of having designed, manufactured, tested, marketed, sold and placed into the stream of commerce an unreasonably dangerous product which was the direct and proximate cause of Plaintiff's injuries and damages.

21. As a direct and proximate result of receiving the Defendants' Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch, the Plaintiff suffered the loss of her former state of physical and mental well being, and suffered serious injuries to her body, was seriously and permanently injured and has required and/or will require medical care and attention, including additional surgery, additional hospital admission, additional physical therapy, and will continue to require medical care and attention; she has suffered and will continue to suffer great mental anguish, severe chronic pain and agony as a result of the happening of the occurrence; has incurred and will continue to incur lost wages and earnings as a result of the happening of the occurrence; and is permanently disabled as a result of the happening of the occurrence, and was otherwise injured and damaged.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, BRENDA LEE COLEMAN claims the sum of Ten Million Dollars (\$10,000,000.00) in compensatory and punitive damages from the



Defendants, DAVOL, INC., and C.R. BARD, INC., and each of them, plus interest and costs.

**COUNT III**  
**Warranty**

22. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 21 as though they were fully restated herein.

23. As vendors of the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch, the Defendants, DAVOL and BARD, made certain warranties, express and implied, that the component was merchantable, fit for the intended purpose and safe for normal use.

24. Contrary to these warranties of merchantability, fitness and safety, express and implied, the Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch failed to operate properly when used in the manner for which it was intended to be used and for the purpose for which it was intended to be used.

25. Plaintiff and her physicians relied upon the skill and judgment of the Defendants in selecting, designing, manufacturing, testing, marketing and selling the product for its intended and ordinary purposes.

26. No negligence on the part of the Plaintiff contributed to the happening of the occurrence in anyway hereto.

27. The Plaintiff's injuries and damages as recited herein, occurred directly and were proximately caused by the breach of warranty of the Defendants as described herein.

28. As a direct and proximate result of receiving the Defendants' Ventralex Hernia Mesh Patch, the Plaintiff suffered the loss of her former state of physical and

mental well being, and suffered serious injuries to her body, was seriously and permanently injured and has required and/or will require medical care and attention, including additional surgery, additional hospital admission, additional physical therapy, and will continue to require medical care and attention; she has suffered and will continue to suffer great mental anguish, severe chronic pain and agony as a result of the happening of the occurrence; has incurred and will continue to incur lost wages and earnings as a result of the happening of the occurrence; and is permanently disabled as a result of the happening of the occurrence, and was otherwise injured and damaged.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, BRENDA LEE COLEMAN claims the sum of Ten Million Dollars (\$10,000,000.00) in compensatory and punitive damages from the Defendants, DAVOL, INC., and C.R. BARD, INC., and each of them, plus interest and costs.

Respectfully submitted,

**LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW N. SINDLER,  
LLC**

By: /S/ Andrew N. Sindler, Esq.  
Andrew N. Sindler, #16743  
P.O. Box 1107  
Severna Park, MD 21146  
410-274-4777  
410-480-7081 (Fax)  
[Andrewsindler@gmail.com](mailto:Andrewsindler@gmail.com)  
Attorneys for the Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND (Northern Division)**

BRENDA LEE COLEMAN :  
 :  
 Plaintiff, :  
 :  
 v. : Civil No.:  
 :  
 DAVOL, INC., et al. :  
 :  
 Defendants. :

**REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL**

The Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial in the above captioned matter on all issues herein.

Respectfully submitted,

**LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW N. SINDLER,  
LLC**

By: /S/ Andrew N. Sindler, Esq.  
Andrew N. Sindler, #16743  
P.O. Box 1107  
Severna Park, MD 21146  
410-274-4777  
410-480-7081 (Fax)  
[Andrewsindler@gmail.com](mailto:Andrewsindler@gmail.com)  
Attorneys for the Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND (Northern Division)**

BRENDA LEE COLEMAN :  
507 Bowleys Quarters Road, Apt. B :  
Middle River, Maryland 21220 :

Plaintiff, :

v. : Civil No.:

DAVOL, INC. :  
100 Crossings Boulevard :  
Providence, Rhode Island 02886 :

SERVE: Resident Agent/Owner: :  
CT Corporation System :  
10 Weybosset Street :  
Providence, Rhode Island 02903 :

AND :

C.R. BARD, INC. :  
730 Central Avenue :  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974 :

SERVE: Resident Agent/Owner: :  
Jean F. Holloway :  
730 Central Avenue :  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974 :

Defendants. :

**LINE**

PLEASE return Summonses to the undersigned counsel for service by private  
process server.

Respectfully submitted,

**LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW N. SINDLER,  
LLC**

By: /S/ Andrew N. Sindler, Esq.  
Andrew N. Sindler, #16743  
P.O. Box 1107  
Severna Park, MD 21146  
410-274-4777  
410-480-7081 (Fax)  
[Andrewsindler@gmail.com](mailto:Andrewsindler@gmail.com)  
Attorneys for the Plaintiff

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

DEFENDANTS

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question, 4 Diversity

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, PTF DEF, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Table with 5 columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District, 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer, 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

Brief description of cause:

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44**

## Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.  
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.  
 United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.  
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.  
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.  
 Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.  
 Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.  
 Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.  
 Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.  
 Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.  
 Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.  
 Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.  
**PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.  
 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.  
 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

**Date and Attorney Signature.** Date and sign the civil cover sheet.





Civil Action No. \_\_\_\_\_

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

*(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))*

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_, who is  
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because \_\_\_\_\_; or

Other *(specify)*: \_\_\_\_\_.

My fees are \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for travel and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for services, for a total of \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Printed name and title*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's address*

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

\_\_\_\_\_ District of \_\_\_\_\_

	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
_____	)	
<i>Plaintiff(s)</i>	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No.
	)	
	)	
	)	
_____	)	
<i>Defendant(s)</i>	)	

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: *(Defendant's name and address)*

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk*

Civil Action No. \_\_\_\_\_

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

*(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))*

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_, who is  
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because \_\_\_\_\_; or

Other *(specify)*: \_\_\_\_\_.

My fees are \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for travel and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for services, for a total of \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Printed name and title*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's address*

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: