

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
JONESBORO DIVISION**

CEDRIC GLAZE

PLAINTIFF

v.

Case No. 3:15-cv-00161 KGB/BD

MIKE ALLEN, et al

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Before the Court are three Partial Recommended Dispositions (“RD”) submitted by United States Magistrate Judge Beth Deere (Dkt. Nos. 40; 52; 53). The first RD recommends that this Court grant separate defendant the City of West Memphis’s motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 40). Plaintiff Cedrick Glaze does not object to the dismissal of the City of West Memphis as a defendant in this case (Dkt. No. 50). Accordingly, the Court concludes that the first RD should be, and hereby is, approved and adopted (Dkt. No. 40). The City of West Memphis’s motion to dismiss is granted (Dkt. No. 33).

The second RD recommends that this Court dismiss without prejudice Mr. Glaze’s claims against defendant Stone because “[t]he time for service on Defendant Stone has passed, and Defendant Stone has not been served with a summons or a copy of the complaint.” (Dkt. No. 52, at 2). Mr. Glaze objected to this RD, claiming that defendant Stone is Ryan Stone, who has filed an answer to the complaint (Dkt. No. 56). Defendants have stipulated that Mr. Glaze has served Ryan Stone with the summons and complaint (Dkt. No. 57). For these reasons, the Court declines to adopt the second RD (Dkt. No. 52).

The third RD recommends that this Court dismiss without prejudice Mr. Glaze’s claims against the John Doe defendants in this case based on Mr. Glaze’s failure to identify and serve these defendants within the time allowed (Dkt. No. 53). Mr. Glaze has not objected to this RD,

and the time to do so has passed.¹ After carefully considering the third RD, the Court concludes that the third RD should be, and hereby is, approved and adopted in its entirety as this Court's findings in all respects (Dkt. No. 53).

So ordered this 26th day of April, 2016.



Kristine G. Baker
United States District Judge

¹ Mr. Glaze indicates in his objections to the second RD that he objects to the third RD, as well. However, his filing is solely focused on the recommendation to dismiss defendant Stone and does not address the John Doe defendants (Dkt. No. 56).