

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

CORNELIUS MADDOX,

Plaintiff,

v.

PETER ERICKSEN, MARK S. STUTLEEN,  
WENDY BRUNS, DENNIS MOSHER,  
MALEAH CUMMINGS and MARIA. AMARANTE,

Defendants.

---

ORDER

10-cv-831-sl

In an order entered on March 27, 2012, this court granted plaintiff's request to proceed on his retaliation claim against defendants Ericksen, Stutleen, Bruns, Mosher, Cummings and Amarante. The Attorney General's office has accepted service of plaintiff's complaint on behalf all of the defendants except defendant Maria Amarante. Therefore, the clerk of court has prepared Marshals Service and summons forms for Amarante and is forwarding copies of the complaint and completed forms to the United States Marshal for service.

In completing the Marshals Service forms, the clerk has provided a forwarding address where defendant Amarante may be served. For plaintiff's information, in *Sellers v. United States*, 902 F.2d 598, 602 (7th Cir. 1990), the court of appeals recognized the security concerns that arise when prisoners have access to the personal addresses of former or current prison employees. For this reason prison employees often take steps to insure that their personal addresses are not available in public records accessible through the internet. The marshal is to maintain defendant Amarante's address in confidence rather than reveal it on the marshals service forms because the forms are filed in the court's public file and mailed to the plaintiff after service is effected.

Finally, plaintiff is reminded that pursuant to an informal service agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Justice and this court, the Department has agreed to accept electronic service of documents on behalf of the defendants it represents. This means that for the remainder of this lawsuit, plaintiff does not have to send a paper copy of each document he files with the court to the Department or defendants Ericksen, Stutleen, Bruns, Mosher, Cummings. The Department will access the document through the court's electronic filing system.

However, because the Department is not representing defendant Amarante, plaintiff will still be required to send counsel for this defendant paper copies of each document he files with the court. Discovery requests or responses are an exception to the electronic service rule. Usually, those documents should be sent directly to counsel for the opposing party and do not have to be sent to the court. Discovery procedures will be explained more fully at the preliminary pretrial conference.

#### ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the U.S. Marshal shall make reasonable efforts to locate defendant Amarante and, if his efforts are successful, to serve Amarante with a copy of the summons and complaint in this case. If the Marshal is unsuccessful in locating this defendant despite making reasonable efforts to locate her, he may file an unexecuted return on which he describes the efforts he made.

Entered this 12<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER  
Magistrate Judge