

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

RUFINA O. CAMILO,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 15-0641 (RC)
)	
)	
COMMISSIONER, SOCIAL)	
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pending before the court is Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint, ECF No. 4. On June 11, 2015, plaintiff Rufina O. Camilo was ordered to respond to the motion by July 20, 2015, or risk summary dismissal of the case. *See* Order, ECF No. 6. Ms. Camilo has not complied with the order and has not sought additional time to do so. Hence this case will be dismissed on what is considered to be a conceded motion to dismiss. *See Twelve John Does v. District of Columbia*, 117 F.3d 571, 577 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (“Where the district court relies on the absence of a response as a basis for treating a motion as conceded, [the District of Columbia Circuit] honor[s] its enforcement” of the local rule.); *accord Fox v. Am. Airlines, Inc.*, 389 F.3d 1291, 1294-95 (D.C. Cir. 2004); *FDIC v. Bender*, 127 F.3d 58, 67-68 (D.C. Cir. 1997). A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

_____/s/_____
RUDOLPH CONTRERAS
United States District Judge

Date: August 19, 2015