

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

United States of America,	)	C/A No.: 3:15-4189-TLW-SVH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	
William F. Gorski,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

---


On October 9, 2015, the United States of America (“Plaintiff”) filed a complaint against William F. Gorski (“Defendant”) seeking to collect on a debt. [ECF No. 1]. Plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment on June 21, 2016. [ECF No. 14]. Although Defendant is an attorney, because he is also 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 July 28, 2016. [ECF No. 15]. Defendant was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Plaintiff’s motion may be granted. *Id.*

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court’s Roseboro order, Defendant failed to properly respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion and does not oppose an entry of judgment against him in this action. Based on the foregoing, Defendant is directed to advise the court whether he opposes Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment and to file a response to Plaintiff’s motion by August 12, 2016. Defendant is further advised that if he fails to respond, the undersigned will recommend judgment be entered against him based on his

failure to defend. See Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

July 29, 2016  
Columbia, South Carolina



Shiva V. Hodges  
United States Magistrate Judge