

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION
CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:13-CV-001-MOC-DCK**

SHARON T. THOMAS,)
)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
)
 v.)
)
)
 STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,)
 MECKLENBURG COUNTY OVERNMENT,)
 MECKLENBURG COUNTY DEPARTMENT)
 OF SOCIAL SERVICES, MECKLENBURG)
 COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN)
 RESOURCES, MECKLENBURG COUNTY)
 PUBLIC LIBRARY, and MECKLENBURG)
 COUNTY OF MENTAL HEALTH,)
)
 Defendants.)

ORDER

THIS MATTER IS BEFORE THE COURT *sua sponte* regarding the filing of “Defendants’ State Of North Carolina And Attorney General’s Motion To Dismiss Amended Complaint” (Document No. 23).

In accordance with Roseboro v.Garrison 582 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the Court advises Plaintiff, who is proceeding *pro se*, that she has a right to respond to the Defendants’ motion. The Court also advises Plaintiff that failure to respond may result in Defendants being granted the relief they seek, that is, the dismissal of the Complaint.


In addition, the undersigned observes that Plaintiff has filed several lawsuits in recent years, either with this Court, or that were removed to this Court. See 3:11-CV-386-FDW; 3:11-CV-387-FDW; 3:12-CV-486-RJC; and 3:12-CV-038-FDW. These lawsuits name numerous defendants, including the State of North Carolina, and most, if not all, of the defendants in these

actions have subsequently been dismissed. As such, it appears that Plaintiff is well-acquainted with the standard of review to maintain an action in this Court.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file a response to “Defendants’ State Of North Carolina And Attorney General’s Motion To Dismiss Amended Complaint” (Document No. 23) on or before **April 8, 2013**. Failure to file a timely and persuasive response will likely lead to the dismissal of this lawsuit.

SO ORDERED.

Signed: March 22, 2013



David C. Keesler
United States Magistrate Judge

