

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X

KEOSHA THOMAS,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

-against-

17-CV-1519 (RRM)

JEFFREY MILLER, et al.,

Defendants.

-----X

ROANNE L. MANN, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE:

Plaintiff *pro se* Keosha Thomas (“plaintiff”) commenced this civil rights action on March 17, 2017. See Complaint (Mar. 17, 2017) (“Compl.”), Electronic Case Filing Docket Entry (“DE”) #1. At paragraph 13 of plaintiff’s complaint, she alleges that her address is 7253 Watson Road, DMB 1014, St. Louis, MO 63119. See Compl. ¶ 13; see also id. at 36.¹ On the verification page attached to the complaint, and on the Civil Cover Sheet, plaintiff lists her address as 1253 Watson Road, St. Louis, MO 63117. See id. at 35; Civil Cover Sheet (Mar. 17, 2017), DE #1-1. Plaintiff did not provide a phone number or email address in any of her submissions.

This Court mailed Orders to plaintiff on April 5, 2017 and April 17, 2017, respectively, to both addresses, but without the “DMB 1014.” Copies of each order were returned by the United States Postal Service with the notation “Unable to Forward.” See Mail Returned as Undeliverable (May 4, 2017), DE #9; Mail Returned as Undeliverable (May 5, 2017), DE #10. Based on the Court’s own research, 1253 Watson Road does not appear to be

¹ Page references to the complaint refer to the page numbers assigned by the Court’s Electronic Case Filing system.

a valid address. In fact, the April 17, 2017 Order mailed to 1253 Watson Road was returned with the notation “No Such Number.”² See DE #9 at 6. The mailings sent to 7253 Watson Road were returned with a notation -- “UNDELIVERABLE - Commercial Mail Receiving Agency - No Authorization to Receive Mail for this Addressee.” See id. By letter dated May 4, 2017, counsel for defendants Deputy Sheriff Joseph Fusicto and Deputy Sheriff D. Pratt advised the Court that on March 31, 2017, he sent a letter to plaintiff at 1253 Watson Road, and on April 19, 2017, he sent a letter to plaintiff at 7253 Watson Road, but both mailings sent via United Parcel Service were returned as undeliverable. See Status Report (May 4, 2017) and Exs. B, D, DE #8, DE #8-2, DE #8-4.

Parties, including *pro se* litigants, are obligated to provide the Court with a current address. See Thomas v. Shaver, No. 07-CV-3048 (KAM)(LB), 2009 WL 935706, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. Apr. 7, 2009); Garcia v. Hynes, No. 08 CV 3115 (RJD)(LB), 2009 WL 890640, at *1 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2009). Where the Court is unable to contact a *pro se* litigant as a result of his or her failure to provide a current address, the case may be dismissed as abandoned. See Brown v. New York City Dep’t of Corrections, No. 11 Civ. 5315 (GBD)(FM), 2012 WL 7827803, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 19, 2012); Thomas, 2009 WL 935706, at *1-*2; Garcia, 2009 WL 890640, at *1-*2.

² Out of an abundance of caution, this Court has used two different zip codes to send mail to 1253 Watson Road, but both mailings were returned.

This Court will attempt to re-send the returned mail, along with copies of this Order, addressed to plaintiff, and to the Pamela Taylor Family Trust,³ at 7253 Watson Road using the “DMB 1014” as part of the address. However, plaintiff must advise the Court in writing of her current address by May 22, 2017. If plaintiff fails to do so, this Court will recommend dismissal of the action as abandoned. In the interim, defendants’ time to answer or otherwise respond to the complaint is extended *sine die*.

SO ORDERED.

**Dated: Brooklyn, New York
May 8, 2017**

/s/ *Roanne L. Mann*
ROANNE L. MANN
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

³ At paragraph 13 of the complaint, plaintiff lists the Pamela Taylor Family Trust alongside the 7253 Watson Road address.