

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

STEPHANIE M. ANASTAS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil No. 20-cv-156-MAB ¹
)	
COMMISSIONER of SOCIAL SECURITY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

BEATTY, Magistrate Judge:

In accordance with 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), the *pro se* plaintiff seeks judicial review of the final agency decision denying her application for social security disability benefits pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 423.

Plaintiff’s brief was originally due by June 5, 2020. When plaintiff missed that deadline, the Court issued a Notice of Impending Dismissal. In that Notice, the Court gave plaintiff an extension to August 6, 2020, in which to file her brief. The Court then gave Plaintiff another extension to August 28, 2020. (Docs. 16, 18, 19). The Notice, Doc. 18, warned Plaintiff that failure to file her brief as ordered “may result in sanctions, including the dismissal of this case.”

On August 14, 2020, Plaintiff responded to the Notice by requesting that her case be dismissed. *See*, Doc. 20.

Plaintiff has failed to file a brief as ordered and has failed to diligently pursue

¹ This case was assigned to the undersigned for final disposition upon consent of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(c). *See*, Doc. 13.

this case. This Court gave plaintiff the “warning shot” required by *Ball v. City of Chicago*, 2 F.3d 752, 755 (7th Cir. 1993) in Docs. 18 and 19. Pursuant to *Johnson v. Chicago Board of Education*, 718 F.3d 731 (7th Cir. 2013), the Court has considered whether a sanction short of dismissal of this case might be fruitful and finds that it would not. Therefore, this case is **DISMISSED with prejudice**. The Clerk of Court shall enter judgment accordingly.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: August 17, 2020

s/ Mark A. Beatty
MARK A. BEATTY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE