

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


Mary I. Bell,)	C/A No.: 3:17-2722-JFA-SVH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
SDH Education East LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

Mary I. Bell (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed this employment case in state court and it was removed to this court on October 6, 2017. [ECF No. 1]. On December 13, 2017, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss. [ECF No. 23]. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising her of the importance of the motion and of the need for her to file an adequate response by January 16, 2018. [ECF No. 24]. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if she failed to respond adequately, Defendant’s motion may be granted. *Id.* On January 18, 2018, and February 16, 2018, the undersigned granted Plaintiff’s requests for additional time to respond, extending her deadline to March 15, 2018. [ECF Nos. 28, 32].

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 she does not oppose the motion and wishes to

abandon this action. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether she wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendant's motion to dismiss by April 3, 2018. Plaintiff is further advised that if she 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 20, 2018
Columbia, South Carolina

Shiva V. Hodges
United States Magistrate Judge