

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

Dean A. Holcolmb,	)	C/A No.: 1:16-3487-MGL-SVH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
Tim Riley; Andrea Thompson;	)	ORDER
Lieutenant Story; Lieutenant Martin;	)	
Ms. Albert; Annie Rumler; Major	)	
Jackson; Officer Spigner; Ms. Marshal;	)	
and D. Utley,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	


---

Dean A. Holcolmb (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on October 25, 2016. [ECF No. 1]. On January 26, 2017, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss. [ECF No. 28]. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of the motion and of the need for him to file an adequate response by February 27, 2017. [ECF No. 29]. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendants’ motion may be granted. *Id.*

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court’s Roseboro order, Plaintiff 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, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendants’ motion to dismiss by March 17, 2017. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, this action will 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.



March 3, 2017  
Columbia, South Carolina

Shiva V. Hodges  
United States Magistrate Judge