

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MATTHEW HALE,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHAEL COLLIS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 21-1469 (JEB)

ORDER

In response to Plaintiff's Complaint, the Defendants have filed a Motion to Dismiss. Because consideration of Defendants' Motion could dispose of this case, Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, is advised of the following:

In Fox v. Strickland, 837 F.2d 507 (D.C. Cir. 1988), the Court of Appeals held that a district court must take pains to advise a *pro se* party of the consequences of failing to respond to a dispositive motion. Plaintiff's attention is directed to Local Civil Rule 7(b), which states:

Within . . . such . . . time as the court may direct, an opposing party shall serve and file a memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to the motion. If such a memorandum is not filed within the prescribed time, the court may treat the motion as conceded.

LCvR 7(b). Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Plaintiff shall respond to Defendants' Motion by February 23, 2022. If Plaintiff does not respond by that date the Court may treat the Motion as conceded and the Complaint may be dismissed.

/s/ James E. Boasberg
JAMES E. BOASBERG
United States District Judge

Date: January 26, 2022