Deutsch Bank National Trust Company v. Brader et al Doc. 23

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

Deutsch Bank National Trust Company, Plaintiff,	)	C/A No. 4:15-600-RBH-KDW
vs.	)	ORDER *Requires Response from Brader by May 11, 2015*
Todd Brader, Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Defendants.	)	

Defendant Todd Brader, proceeding pro se, removed this foreclosure action from the Horry County, South Carolina Court of Common Pleas, based on the court's diversity jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. § 1332. *See* ECF No. 1 at 2-3; *see also* ECF No. 9 (containing "Addition to Notice of Removal"). Arguably, the matter was also removed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. *Id.* at 1-2. On April 3, 2015, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Remand, setting forth several legal reasons the matter should be remanded. ECF No. 22.

Defendant Brader is advised that Plaintiff's Motion to Remand, if granted, would end his case in this court and return it to the Horry County Court of Common Pleas. Defendant has the right to submit a response to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand. Any such response must be provided to the court no later than **May 11, 2015**.

In the event Defendant Brader does not respond adequately to the Motion to Remand by this date, Plaintiff's motion may be granted, thereby returning the case to the court from which it was removed.[1] *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(c).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

April 6, 2015
Florence, South Carolina

Kaymani D. West
United States Magistrate Judge

[1] This Order puts Defendant Brader on notice of the importance of responding to the Motion to Remand and the potential consequences of not responding. *Cf. Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975).

Dockets.Justia.com