-DCK Rammal v. Vera et al Doc. 10

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:11-CV-189-MOC-DCK

NOHA RAMMAL,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) ORDER
CHRISTIE CANEDO, JESUS GUZMAN, JR., and))
YOLANDA M. VERA,)
Defendants.)
	 /

THIS MATTER IS BEFORE THE COURT *sua sponte* regarding the filing of Defendant's "Motion To Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint" (Document No. 6).

In accordance with <u>Roseboro v. Garrison</u>, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the Court advises Plaintiff, who is proceeding *pro se*, that she has a right to respond to Defendant's motion. The Court also advises Plaintiff that failure to respond may result in Defendant being granted the relief it seeks, that is, the dismissal of the Complaint.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff may respond to the pending "Motion To Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint" (Document No. 6) on or before **August 22, 2011**. Failure to file a timely and persuasive response will likely lead to the dismissal of this lawsuit.

Signed: August 8, 2011

David C. Keesler
United States Magistrate Judge