

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

LAVELLE SEARCY (#195469),

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 2:10-CV-11242  
JUDGE DENISE PAGE HOOD  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE PAUL J. KOMIVES

v.

ARAMARK CORPORATION  
and MACOMB COUNTY,

Defendants,

---

**ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO PROVIDE AN ADDRESS AT WHICH  
DEFENDANT MACOMB COUNTY MAY BE SERVED**

**A. At this time, the only remaining parties are plaintiff Searcy and defendants Aramark Corporation and Macomb County.**

On March 29, 2010, Lavelle Searcy (#195469) and four (4) others initiated this lawsuit against three (3) defendants: Aramark Corporation, Mark A. Hackel and the Macomb County Jail (MCJ). Doc. Ent. 1. On October 14, 2010, Correctional Medical Services, Inc. (CMS) and Medical Director/Supervisor Doe were added as defendants. Doc. Ent. 32.<sup>1</sup> On March 15, 2011, Valerie Watkins was substituted for defendant Medical Director/Supervisor Doe. Doc. Ent. 80.

On June 28, 2012, Searcy filed an amended complaint against MCJ, Hackel, Aramark Corporation, CMS and Medical Director/Supervisor Doe. Doc. Ent. 149.<sup>2</sup> However, by way of the Court's March 26, 2013 order (Doc. Ent. 208), plaintiffs Kenneth Witherspoon, William

---

<sup>1</sup>Aramark Corporation filed an answer (Doc. Ent. 45), Hackel and MCJ filed an answer (Doc. Ent. 55), and Searcy filed a response (Doc. Ent. 69).

<sup>2</sup>MCJ and Hackel (Doc. Ent. 155) and Aramark Corporation, properly known as Aramark Correctional Services, Inc., (Doc. Ent. 159) have filed answers to the amended complaint.

Johnson, Shannon Sexton and James Holland were dismissed with prejudice; defendants MCJ, Hackel, CMS and Watkins's motions to dismiss (Doc. Entries 163 & 156) were granted; and Macomb County was added as a defendant. Thus, at this time, the only remaining parties are plaintiff Searcy and defendants Aramark Corporation and Macomb County.<sup>3</sup>

**B. The Court's March 31, 2014 order directs the U.S. Marshal to serve plaintiff's amended complaint on defendant Macomb County.**

By her March 31, 2014 order (Doc. Ent. 238), Judge Hood adopted my February 12, 2014 report and recommendation (Doc. Ent. 233), denied defendant Macomb County's motion to dismiss (Doc. Ent. 214) and directed the U.S. Marshal to serve plaintiff's June 28, 2012 amended complaint (Doc. Ent. 149) on Macomb County. However, before the Clerk's Office prepares the paperwork for service, it needs an address at which Macomb County may be served.

**C. Order**

Accordingly, within fourteen (14) days of the date of this order, plaintiff SHALL provide the Court with an address at which defendant Macomb County may be served.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The attention of the parties is drawn to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), which provides a period of fourteen (14) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order within which to file objections for consideration by the district judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Dated: May 8, 2014

s/Paul J. Komives  
PAUL J. KOMIVES  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

---

<sup>3</sup>Pending before Judge Hood is Aramark Corporation's April 2, 2013 motion for summary judgment (Doc. Ent. 209), regarding which I have entered a February 12, 2014 report and recommendation (Doc. Ent. 232).

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was sent to parties of record on May 8, 2014, electronically and/or by U.S. Mail.

s/Michael Williams  
Case Manager for the  
Honorable Paul J. Komives