Morgan v. Proctor et al Doc. 35

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS WESTERN DIVISION

DERRICK MORGAN, \*

\*

Plaintiff,

\* No. 4:09CV00744 SWW

\*

WILLARD PROCTOR, ET AL.,

VS.

\*

Defendants.

\*

## Order

Pending before the Court are two motions to dismiss and a motion to compel to which plaintiff failed to respond. On May 14, 2010, the Court sent plaintiff by certified and regular mail an Order directing him to respond to the motions, warning him that failure to do so could result in the dismissal of his case. Plaintiff's certified mail has been returned to the Court as undeliverable. Plaintiff has failed to respond to the motions or otherwise correspond with the Court..

Local Rule 5.5 (c)(2) provides that it is the duty of a party not represented by counsel to promptly notify the Clerk of any change in his address, to monitor the progress of the case, and to prosecute the action diligently. If any communication from the Court to a *pro se* plaintiff is not responded to within thirty (30) days, the case may be dismissed without prejudice.

The Court finds plaintiff complaint should be and is hereby dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Local Rule 5.5(c)(2).

SO ORDERED this 19th day of July, 2010.

/s/Susan Webber Wright
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE