Muhaimin v. Jacobs et al Doc. 20

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Shakur A. Muhaimin,) C/A No. 5:15-cv-04972-JFA-KDW
Plaintiff,))) ORDER
VS.)
)
Dr. T. Jacobs, and	
Dr. Barry Weissglass,)
Defendants.)
)
)

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 19, 2016, Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss the case. ECF No. 15. Because Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, on February 22, 2016 the court entered an Order pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) advising him of the importance of a motion to dismiss and of the need for him to file an adequate response. ECF No. 18. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendant's Motion may be granted, thereby ending this case.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's *Roseboro* Order, Plaintiff has 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 Defendant's Motion to Dismiss by **April 11, 2016**. 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 31, 2016 Florence, South Carolina Kaymani D. West United States Magistrate Judge

Kayman D. Hest