

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
WESTERN DIVISION**

**DANIEL R. WILSON,  
ADC #138100**

**PLAINTIFF**

**v.**

**CASE NO. 4:11CV00193 BSM/JTK**

**TERRY BAILEY**

**DEFENDANT**

**ORDER**

On March 8, 2011, plaintiff Daniel R. Wilson's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* was granted. [Doc. No. 3]. Because his complaint was too vague and conclusory to permit the screening mandated by 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, however, Wilson was directed to file an amended complaint within thirty (30) days. Wilson was further advised that failure to comply would result in the dismissal, without prejudice, of his complaint.

The copy of the order sent to Wilson was returned to sender on March 14, 2011. [Doc. No. 6]. On that same date, Wilson notified the clerk's office of a change in his address, and a copy of the March 8, 2011, order was resent to him at the new address. [Doc. No. 7]. As of this date, however, Wilson has not filed an amended complaint.

Local Rule 5.5(c)(2) provides as follows:

It is the duty of any party not represented by counsel to promptly notify the Clerk and the other parties to the proceedings of any change in his or her address, to monitor the progress of the case and to prosecute or defend 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 . . . .

In light of his failure to respond to the March 8, 2011, order, Wilson's complaint is hereby dismissed without prejudice. An appropriate judgment shall accompany this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 25th day of April, 2011.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE