

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

RODOLFO AVELAR, as Personal	)	
Representative of the Estate of	)	
Andrew Avelar, Deceased,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. CIV-24-909-D
	)	
OKLAHOMA COUNTY CRIMINAL	)	
JUSTICE AUTHORITY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Rodolfo Avelar, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Andrew Avelar, brought this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Oklahoma state law. Defendant Board of County Commissioners for Oklahoma County (Board) moved to dismiss Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint [Doc. No. 16], to which Plaintiff filed a response [Doc. No. 19]. The matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Shon T. Erwin for initial proceedings in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and (C).


On February 14, 2025, the magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation [Doc. No. 23], in which he recommended denying the Board's Motion to Dismiss [Doc. No. 16]. The magistrate judge notified the Board that it could file an objection to the R&R on or before March 3, 2025, and that failure to timely object to the R&R waives the right to appellate review of both factual and legal issues contained therein. *See Casanova v. Ulibarri*, 595 F.3d 1120, 1123 (10th Cir. 2010).

Upon review of the file and noting no timely objection to the findings and recommendations of the magistrate judge, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation [Doc. No. 23] in its entirety.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that, for the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation, the Board's Motion to Dismiss [Doc. No. 16] is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Board's previous Motion to Dismiss [Doc. No. 7], which addressed Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint [Doc. No. 1-2], is therefore **DENIED** as **MOOT**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 5<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2025.



---

TIMOTHY D. DeGIUSTI  
Chief United States District Judge