

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Glenn D. Bright,	)	C/A No. 0:12-2259-CMC-PJG
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Chris White; Ken Pollet; and P. Kaufmann,	)	
Inc.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

The plaintiff, who is self-represented, has filed this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights by the named defendants. The defendants filed a motion to dismiss on August 23, 2013, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (ECF No. 59.) As the plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the court entered an order pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) on August 26, 2013, advising the plaintiff of the importance of a motion to dismiss and of the need for him to file an adequate response. (ECF No. 61.) The plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, the defendants' motion may be granted, thereby ending his case.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's Roseboro order, the plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon this action.

Based on the foregoing, it is

**ORDERED** that the plaintiff shall advise the court as to whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to the defendants' motion to dismiss within fourteen (14) days from

the date of this order. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, **this action may be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute.** See Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

Paige J. Gossett

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

October 3, 2013  
Columbia, South Carolina