

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

KWADWO BONSU,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS —
AMHERST, PATRICIA CARDOSO, DAVID
VAILLANCOURT, ENKU GELAYE, LOUIS
WARD, and JONATHAN CONNARY

Defendants.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Civil Action No. 15-30172-MGM

ORDER

March 23, 2016

MASTROIANNI, U.S.D.J.

Plaintiff Kwadwo Bonsu filed his complaint on September 25, 2016 (Dkt. No. 1.) On January 29, 2016 Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction and a Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim. (Dkt. Nos. 11 & 13.) Under the Local Rules, Plaintiff had fourteen days, until February 12, 2016, to oppose Defendants’ motions to dismiss, L.R. 7.1(b)(2), making the opposition due on February 12, 2016. Rather than file an opposition, on February 12, 2016, Plaintiff filed a request for additional time to respond. (Dkt. No. 15.) The court granted that request, setting a new deadline of March 3, 2016. (Dkt. No. 16.) On March 3, 2016, Plaintiff requested a second extension through March 17, 2016. (Dkt. No. 17.) As that motion was not assented to by Defendants, the court granted an extension, but only through March 10, 2016. (Dkt. No. 18.) Plaintiff then filed an assented to motion, and the court extended the time for Plaintiff to

file his opposition through March 17, 2016. (Dkt. Nos. 19 & 20.) To date, Plaintiff has not yet filed an opposition or a request for a further extension of time.

The court now Orders Plaintiff to respond to Defendants' motions by April 6, 2016. Should Plaintiff fail to file a response to the motions to dismiss by that date, he faces dismissal of his claims due to failure to prosecute and failure to obey this Order.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that by the end of the day on April 6, 2016, Plaintiff shall respond to the motions to dismiss. Failure to respond to the motions to dismiss may be grounds for dismissal for failure to prosecute. *See e.g. Tower Ventures, Inc. v. City of Westfield*, 296 F.3d 43, 45 (1st Cir. 2002) (“[D]isobedience to court orders, in and of itself, constitutes extreme misconduct (and, thus, warrants dismissal)[.]”); *Rosario-Diaz v. Gonzalez*, 140 F.3d 312, 315 (1st Cir. 1998) (“[A] litigant who ignores a case-management deadline does so at his peril.”).

It is So Ordered.

/s/ Mark G. Mastroianni

MARK G. MASTROIANNI

United States District Judge