

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

FREDERICK RIDEOUT GRAY, JR.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
-vs-)	Case No. CIV-17-0137-F
)	
GEO GROUP INC., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Two Reports and Recommendations by Magistrate Judge Bernard M. Jones are before the court. Doc. nos. 102, 103.

1. Doc. no. 102

The Report and Recommendation at doc. no. 102 recommends that the court deny motions to dismiss filed by defendants Thomas, Wells,¹ Richmond, Simpkins and Lange (doc. nos. 85-88, 90) and grant plaintiff a mandatory extension of time within which to locate and perfect service upon these individuals. The Report further states that if the Report is adopted, the magistrate judge anticipates setting a deadline for service, and ordering these defendants’ attorneys to address whether these defendants have agreed to waive service or will provide the magistrate judge with last-known addresses.

¹ Plaintiff’s objection states that the correct spelling of this defendant’s name is “Walls.”

The Report notifies the parties of their right to object to the Report and advises that any objections are due by February 14, 2019. Plaintiff filed a timely objection. Doc. no. 104. There, plaintiff argues that these defendants are already aware of this action as indicated in the Report. (Doc. no. 102, p. 3 of 4, n.3, observes that defendants received actual notice of plaintiff's lawsuit as evidenced by the entry of appearances on their behalf and their motions to dismiss.)

Following de novo review, plaintiff's objection (doc. no. 104) to the Report is **DENIED**. The Report (doc. no. 102) is **ACCEPTED, AFFIRMED** and **ADOPTED**. The motions to dismiss filed by defendants Thomas, Wells, Richmond, Simpkins and Lange (doc. nos. 85-88, 90) are **DENIED**. Plaintiff is **GRANTED** a mandatory extension of time within which to locate these defendants and perfect service upon them. The magistrate judge will set a deadline for service and will order defendants' attorneys to advise the magistrate judge whether these defendants will waive service or provide last-known addresses.

2. Doc. no. 103

The Report and Recommendation at doc. no. 103 recommends that the court deny the motion to dismiss filed by defendant Musallam and order Musallam to answer or otherwise respond to the Amended Complaint within twenty days of any order adopting the Report.

The Report notifies the parties of their right to object to the Report and advises that any objections are due by February 14, 2019. No objections were filed.


Upon review, and with no objections having been filed, the Report (doc. no. 103) is **ACCEPTED, AFFIRMED** and **ADOPTED**. The motion to dismiss filed by defendant Musallam is **DENIED**. Doc. no. 89. Defendant Musallam **SHALL**

answer or respond to the Amended Complaint within twenty days of the date of this order.

3. The Referral Remains in Place

This action remains referred to the magistrate judge.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 26th day of February, 2019.


STEPHEN P. FRIOT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

17-0137p007.docx