

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, SHREVEPORT DIVISION**

**Decalvin Shuntrell Raphiel v. Judge S. Maurice Hicks, Jr., Lloyd
Pitchford, et al.**

Raphiel · No. 25-cv-1119 · Decided January 8, 2026

OPINION

Raphiel

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
SHREVEPORT DIVISION

DECALVIN SHUNTRELL RAPHIEL CIVIL ACTION NO. 25-cv-1119
VERSUS JUDGE S. MAURICE HICKS, JR.
LLOYD PITCHFORD ET AL MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY
MEMORANDUM ORDER

Decalvin Shuntrell Raphiel (“Plaintiff”) filed this civil action in Shreveport City Court, and it was removed to this court based on federal question jurisdiction. The court recently entered a memorandum order (Doc. 54) that addressed Plaintiff’s efforts to amend his complaint. Plaintiff was allowed the opportunity to file a motion for leave to amend that (1) specifically identifies the defendant(s) that Plaintiff intends to sue and (2) states clearly and concisely Plaintiff’s best case in support of the claims that he wishes to pursue. The order noted that any current defendant who was not named in such an amended complaint would be deemed dismissed from the case. Plaintiff responded by filing a motion for leave to file a second amended complaint. Leave was granted, and the second amended complaint states clearly that the only defendants are Trans Union, LLC and Experian Information Solutions, Inc. Accordingly, all claims against defendants Lloyd Pitchford and Tiffani L. Chambers are dismissed, and their pending Motions to Dismiss (Docs. 21 & 23) are denied as moot. Also pending is a Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 39) filed by Trans Union, LLC that attacked a prior amended complaint. The filing of an amended complaint generally moots any motion to dismiss that was filed earlier in response to a prior complaint. *Dozier v. Voodoo Energy Servs. LLC*, 2025 WL 606186, *5 (W.D. La. 2025). Accordingly, Trans Union’s earlier Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 39) is denied without prejudice. Trans Union may respond to the second amended complaint by filing another motion to dismiss or answer as it chooses. Plaintiff’s second amended complaint added new defendant Experian Information Solutions, Inc. Plaintiff is reminded of his obligation under Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 4(m) to serve Experian within 90 days of the filing of his second amended complaint. Plaintiff is ordered to file evidence of valid service on

Experian by April 7, 2026 unless Experian has filed an answer or motion for extension of time prior to that date. **THUS DONE AND SIGNED** in Shreveport, Louisiana, this 8th day of January, 2026. =| Mark L. Hornsby U.S. Magistrate Judge Page 2 of 2