IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

RODNEY HOPKINS,

Plaintiff, ORDER

v. 06-C-597-C

MATTHEW J. FRANK; DR. QUISLING;
GREG GRAMS, Warden, Columbia Correctional
Institution; Warden ROBERT HUMPHREYS, Racine
Correctional Institution; and CO MARSHALL,

Defendants.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this action on claims against the defendants arising out of the nature of plaintiff's dental care in early 2006 and defendant Marshall's allegedly illegal pat down search of plaintiff. The Attorney General's office has accepted service of plaintiff's complaint on behalf of all of the defendants except defendant Quisling, who is no longer employed by the Department of Corrections. Therefore, the clerk of court has prepared Marshals Service and summons forms for this defendant, and is forwarding a copy of the complaint and the completed forms to the United States Marshal for service on him.

In completing the Marshals Service forms for defendant Quisling, the clerk has not provided a forwarding address because this information is unknown. It will be up to the marshal to make a reasonable effort to locate defendant Quisling by contacting his former employer (in this case, the Department of Corrections) or conducting an Internet search of public records for the defendant's current address or both. See Sellers v. United States, 902 F.2d 598, 602 (7th Cir. 1990) (once defendant is identified, marshal to make reasonable effort to obtain current address). Reasonable efforts do not require the marshal to be a private investigator for civil litigants or to use software available only to law enforcement officers to discover addresses for defendants whose whereabouts are not discoverable through public records.

Also, for plaintiff's information, in Sellers, the court of appeals recognized the security concerns that arise when prisoners have access to the personal addresses of former or current prison employees. Sellers v. United States, 902 F.2d at 602. For this reason prison employees often take steps to insure that their personal addresses are not available in public records accessible through the Internet. If the marshal is successful in obtaining defendant Quisling's personal address, he is to maintain that address in confidence rather than reveal

it on the marshals service form, because the form is filed in the court's public file and mailed to the plaintiff after service is effected.

Entered this 30th day of April, 2007.

BY THE COURT:
/s/
BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge