under seal. As to any of the named defendants for whom the Attorney General's Office could not accept service, the Office was instructed to file, *under seal*, the last known address(es) of those defendant(s) for whom it has such information. (ECF No. 18 at 2.)

On December 30, 2016, the Attorney General's Office filed its Acceptance of Service on behalf of Defendant Ira Brannon. (ECF No. 19.) On January 30, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion to respond to Defendant's notice of acceptance of service seeking clarification whether as the Attorney General's Office only accepted service on behalf of Defendant Brannon, and did not include Defendant C. Smith. (ECF No. 21.) The court granted Plaintiff's motion and ordered the Attorney General's Office to advise within ten (10) days of the date of the order whether it would accept service on behalf of Defendant C. Smith. (ECF No. 24 at 2.) The court further ordered that if the Attorney General's Office could not accept service, the Office should file Defendant Smith's last known address under seal. (*Id.*)

On February 9, 2017, the Attorney General's Office filed Defendant Smith's last known address under seal. (ECF No. 27.) Pursuant to that filing, the court issued its order instructing the Clerk to issue a summons for Defendant Smith and provided Plaintiff with instructions as to effecting service on the Defendant. (ECF No. 33.)

On March 29, 2017, the U.S. Marshal filed the return of the summons indicating that service of process was completed as to Defendant Smith on March 22, 2017. (ECF No. 43.)

Although the Attorney General's Office filed a Supplemental Notice of Acceptance of Service (ECF No. 48) on April 19, 2017, indicating it would accept service on behalf of Defendant Smith, an answer or other response to Plaintiff's amended complaint has never been filed on behalf of this Defendant as is required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a).

Plaintiff's Motion to Respond to Defendant Supplemental Notice of Acceptance of Service and File a Default of Judgment under Rule 55(a) for Failing to Plead or Otherwise Defend on C. Smith (ECF No. 51) is **GRANTED** to the extent Plaintiff seeks to have a default entered against Defendant Smith.

26 ///

27 | ///

28 ///

In accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b), Plaintiff must make a separate application for entry of a default *judgment* against Defendant Smith. To the extent Plaintiff's motion seeks to have a default *judgment* entered as to Defendant Smith, Plaintiff's motion is denied.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 16, 2017.

Willen G. Cobb

WILLIAM G. COBB UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE