

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

George Soler Young v. Hector A. Rios et al.

Young · No. CIV-15-641-G · Decided April 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma stayed defendants’ motion to enforce a settlement agreement in a civil rights action brought by George Soler Young. The court found no present dispute regarding the agreement’s existence or terms but recognized that Plaintiff’s allegation of coercion could, if proven, support avoidance of the settlement. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Shon T. Erwin for a judicial settlement conference.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Barbs B. Kadota
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	April 6, 2026
DOCKET	CIV-15-641-G
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to enforce a settlement agreement reached during a judicial settlement conference in this § 1983 action. After considering the parties' briefing, the court stayed the enforcement motion and referred the parties to a second judicial settlement conference.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Settlement-enforcement issues concerning contract formation and construction are resolved under applicable state contract law. When material facts concerning the existence or terms of a settlement are disputed, an evidentiary hearing is generally required; an evidentiary hearing is also appropriate for evaluating fraud in the inducement.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district-court order with no reported citation.

TOPICS

- mediation
- contract formation
- mutual assent
- duress
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties' signed settlement agreement should be enforced notwithstanding Plaintiff's dissatisfaction with the settlement, alleged misunderstanding about payment deductions, and alleged coercive threat during the settlement conference.
2. Whether the record required an evidentiary hearing or further proceedings to evaluate Plaintiff's potentially viable duress defense to enforcement.
3. Whether the court should stay the enforcement motion and refer the parties to another judicial settlement conference.

HOLDINGS

1. A party generally may not repudiate a settlement agreement absent fraud, duress, undue influence, or mistake.
2. Plaintiff's allegation that a unit manager threatened him to accept the settlement could present a valid duress defense if proven, but the existing record did not establish that defense.
3. The court stayed Defendants' motion to enforce the settlement agreement and referred the parties to a second judicial settlement conference.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A trial court has the power to summarily enforce a settlement agreement entered into by the litigants while the litigation is pending before it." (Section III)

"A party generally may not repudiate a settlement agreement absent fraud, duress, undue influence, or mistake." (Section III)

"Plaintiff's assertion that he was 'threaten[ed]' by a unit manager to 'take the settlement' could conceivably present a valid defense to enforcement of the parties' settlement agreement." (Section IV)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties participated in a judicial settlement conference and agreed that Defendants would pay Plaintiff \$50,000 in exchange for a release of all claims and dismissal with prejudice after execution of the settlement documents. Plaintiff, his attorney, and Defendants signed a settlement summary containing those terms. Plaintiff later contended that prison officials had interfered with his legal mail, that a unit manager had threatened him to accept the settlement, and that he misunderstood whether deductions would be taken from the settlement payment. Defendants represented that they remained ready to deliver the settlement check upon receipt of Plaintiff's executed release.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed this prisoner civil-rights action in March 2015. The parties reached and signed an agreement in principle on June 6, 2015, after which the case was administratively closed. Plaintiff later sought to reopen the

case and cancel the settlement, but the court denied rescission and directed that the settlement documents be forwarded to him for execution. Defendants then moved to enforce the settlement, while Plaintiff argued that the agreement was invalid, including because of alleged threats and duress. The court stayed the motion and ordered another judicial settlement conference rather than deciding enforcement on the existing record.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- United States v. Hardage, 982 F.2d 1491, 1496 (10th Cir. 1993)
- In re De-Annexation of Certain Real Property from City of Seminole, 204 P.3d 87, 89 (Okla. 2009)
- Walters v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 703 F.3d 1167, 1172 (10th Cir. 2013)
- Devon Energy Prod. Co. v. Line Finders, LLC, Nos. 21-6119, 21-6162, 2022 WL 4232404, at *5 (10th Cir. Sept. 14, 2022)
- Vela v. Hope Lumber & Supply Co., 966 P.2d 1196, 1198-99 (Okla. Civ. App. 1998)
- Boettler v. Rothmire, 442 P.2d 511, 514-15 (Okla. 1968)
- Percival Constr. Co. v. Miller & Miller Auctioneers, Inc., 532 F.2d 166, 172-73 (10th Cir. 1976)
- Chester v. Parsons, No. CIV-19-860-G, 2021 WL 4343609, at *3 (W.D. Okla. Apr. 19, 2021) (R. & R.), adopted, 2021 WL 4344942 (W.D. Okla. Sept. 23, 2021)