Ajaj v. Federal Bureau of Prisons et al Doc. 155

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 08-cv-02006-MSK-MJW

AHMED M. AJAJ,

Plaintiff,

v.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS, et al.,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

MICHAEL J. WATANABE
United States Magistrate Judge

It is hereby ORDERED that the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff's Motion for an Order Directing BOP to Disclose the Current Address for Defendant Nafziger and Dunlap to Enable Service or in the Alternative Their Addresses be Disclosed Through the Other Active Cases Against Them in this Court or Additional Time be Given to Plaintiff to Obtain Their Addresses [sic](docket no. 144) is MOOT and therefore DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

As to Mr. Dunlap, Magistrate Judge Watanabe has issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that he be dismissed from this action (docket no. 143). The Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff has filed objections to this Recommendation (docket no. 148). If Judge Krieger approves and adopts the Recommendation (docket no. 143), then Mr. Dunlap will no longer be a party to this action. If Judge Krieger does not approve and adopt the Recommendation (docket no. 143), then the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff shall be permitted to re-file the subject motion (docket no. 144) as to Mr. Dunlap only. As to Dr. Nafziger, he has already signed a waiver of service that has been filed with this court. See docket no. 140. Accordingly, there is no reason for the BOP to disclose Dr. Natziger's current address to the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff's Motion for an Order Directing BOP to Provide Him Medical Experts' List and to Allow Him to Confer with and Call Experts in Compliance with Kikmura v. Osagie and Valandingham v. Bojorqves or in the Alternative an Attorney be Appointed (docket no. 136) is premature and therefore DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

Dockets.Justia.com

At the Status Conference and Show Cause Hearing held on February 18, 2010, before Magistrate Judge Watanabe, the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff was given until March 19, 2010, to file his proposed Third Amended Complaint. The Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff had filed his Motion to File Third Amended Complaint Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15 and 21 [sic](docket no. 137) on February 16, 2010, but the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff did not file, at that time, his proposed Third Amended Complaint. Until such time as this court rules on docket no. 137, the relief sought in docket no. 136 is premature and therefore should be denied without prejudice at this time.

Date: March 11, 2010