

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Stephen Charles Paddock, #xxxx4604)	Civil Action No.: 8:08-1705-HFF-BHH
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	<u>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</u>
)	<u>OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE</u>
Ray Nash, Sheriff,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

The plaintiff brought this action seeking relief pursuant to Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983. On July 11, 2008, the defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. On July 15, 2008, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), the plaintiff was advised of the summary judgment procedure and the possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately. Despite this explanation, the plaintiff elected not to respond to the motion.

As the plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the court filed a second order on August 28, 2008, giving the plaintiff through September 19, 2008, to file his response to the motion for summary judgment. The plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond, this action would be dismissed for failure to prosecute. The plaintiff elected not to respond.

Based on the foregoing, it appears the plaintiff no longer wishes to pursue this action. Accordingly, it is recommended that this action be dismissed *with prejudice* for lack of prosecution and for failure to comply with this Court's orders, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the factors outlined in *Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez*, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir.1982). See *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir.

1989).

s/Bruce H. Hendricks
United States Magistrate Judge

September 25, 2008

Greenville, South Carolina Carolina