

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
GEORGIA**

**Calvin Mason v. Komola Edwards, Antoine Caldwell, Sean Gittens,
John Moore, Timothy Phillips, Angie Pittman, Mark Smith,
Woodrow Tripp, and Georgia Department of Corrections**

Mason v. Edwards · No. CV 325-098; 3:25-cv-00098 · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia directs the Clerk to re-serve prior orders and attachments on pro se Plaintiff Calvin Mason after an earlier order was returned as undeliverable. The Court extends the time for service and notifies Plaintiff that he must serve each Defendant within ninety days of the order, or the case or individual defendants may be dismissed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m).

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA DUBLIN DIVISION CALVIN MASON,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) CV 325-098) KOMOLA EDWARDS; ANTOINE) CALDWELL; SEAN GITTENS; JOHN) MOORE; TIMOTHY PHILLIPS; ANGIE) PITTMAN; MARK SMITH; WOODROW) TRIPP; and GEORGIA DEPARTMENT) OF CORRECTIONS,)) Defendants.) _____ O R D E R _____ On October 17, 2025, the Court provided instructions regarding Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f).

(Doc. no. 2.) Further, on October 20, 2025, the undersigned provided basic instructions to Plaintiff as a pro se party. (Doc. no. 3.) The October 20th Order was later returned as undeliverable and marked “Unable to Forward.” (Doc. no. 4.)

On December 1, 2025, the Court received a letter from Plaintiff dated November 24, 2025, providing an updated mailing address and stating he has not received any communication from the Court to date. (Doc. no. 5.) Accordingly, the Court DIRECTS the CLERK to re-serve the Court’s October 17th and 20th Orders and accompanying attachments on Plaintiff at his new address.

(Doc. nos. 2, 3.) This Order shall too be included in the same envelope. In an abundance of caution, the Court also extends Plaintiff’s time to serve Defendants. The Court HEREBY NOTIFIES Plaintiff he must serve each Defendant within ninety days of the date of this Order, and failure to do so may result in the dismissal of individual defendants or the entire case.!

Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). SO ORDERED this 4th day of December, 2025, at Augusta, Georgia. BRIAN E. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA 'Rule 4(m) empowers courts with discretion to extend the time for service when a plaintiff demonstrates good cause for failing to timely serve process or any other circumstances warrant an extension of time.

Henderson v. United States, 517 U.S. 654, 662-63 (1996); Lepone-Dempsey v. Carroll Cnty. Comm'rs, 476 F.3d 1277, 1282 (11th Cir. 2007); Horenkamp v. Van Winkle & Co., 402 F.3d 1129, 1132 (11th Cir. 2005). Because Plaintiff never received its previous Orders, the Court exercises its discretion to extend the time for service.