

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

G&G Closed Circuit Events LLC,)	C/A No.: 3:12-2933-JFA-SVH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
Camden Wing Shack LLC d/b/a The)	ORDER
Wing Shack; and Crystal Lee Bryson)	
a/k/a Crystal L. Bryson a/k/a Crystal)	
Lee Trimnal,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

The court is in receipt of email correspondence dated August 26, 2013, from Plaintiff's counsel's paralegal to the undersigned's ECF filing box. The correspondence (attached hereto as an exhibit) states as follows:

Plaintiff notes that nothing has been filed with the court from Bryson by the August 21, 2013, deadline, nor has Plaintiff received any response whatsoever from Defendant Bryson. As there has been no opposition to Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment as per the Order filed on August 8, 2013 [Entry #33], Plaintiff requests that a determination be made on its motion filed on July 2, 2013 [Entry #30] as per said Order.

This correspondence is in direct contravention of the court's order of August 9, 2013, reminding Plaintiff's counsel that any correspondence should be electronically filed on the docket and should be served on all appearing parties. [Entry #35]. Furthermore, Plaintiff's counsel is expected to be familiar with the court's Standard Filing Preference #12, which provides as follows:

Communications to the court should normally be in the form of a FILED written communication (*i.e.*, motion, memorandum, status report, or other traditionally filed document). All written communications from Filing Users relating to an action should be filed unless there are grounds for an ex parte communication. Other forms of communication (*e.g.*, facsimile, mail, email, hand delivery, or phone) are prohibited unless expressly authorized by judge-specific preference, local rule, or other specific authorization.

See Standard Filing Preferences at <http://www.scd.uscourts.gov/CMECF/preferences.asp>.

Through its own docketing system, the court is aware that Plaintiff's motion is ripe for disposition and intends to rule on the motion in the ordinary course of business. The court will not entertain requests for expedited review, particularly where, as here, the request has been made repeatedly and on an ex parte basis.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



August 26, 2013
Columbia, South Carolina

Shiva V. Hodges
United States Magistrate Judge