

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
EASTERN DIVISION**

---

<p><b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Plaintiff,</b></p> <p><b>VS.</b></p> <p><b>WEST TENNESSEE CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, LLC, and CURTIS BROWN,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Defendants.</b></p>	<p>)</p>	<p><b>No. 1:16-cv-01277-STA-egb</b></p>
---	--	---

---

**ORDER CLOSING CASE ADMINISTRATIVELY**

---

On October 27, 2016, Plaintiff United States of America filed an application for writ of garnishment. The writ of garnishment was issued that same day. The garnishee filed an answer on November 8, 2016, and an Order of Garnishment was entered on December 5, 2016. No other action has been taken in this matter.

Administratively closing a case is a case-management tool used by district courts to obtain an accurate count of active cases. *CitiFinancial Corp. v. Harrison*, 453 F.3d 245, 250 (5th Cir. 2006). That is, the court may close a case administratively for statistical purposes. *Corion Corp. v. Chen*, 964 F.2d 55, 56–57 (1st Cir. 1992); *see also Lehman v. Revolution Portfolio L.L.C.*, 166 F.3d 389 (1st Cir. 1999) (citations omitted) (“Th[is] method is used in various districts throughout the nation in order to shelve pending, but dormant, cases.”). The court in *Lehman* “endorse[d] the judicious use of administrative closings by district courts in circumstances in which a case, though not dead, is likely to remain moribund for an appreciable period of time.” 166 F.3d at 392.

Consequently, the Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to close the case for statistical purposes. Nothing contained in this order shall be considered as a dismissal or disposition of this action. Should further proceedings become necessary, either party may initiate that proceeding in the same manner as if this order had not been entered.

It is so ORDERED.

**s/ S. Thomas Anderson**  
S. THOMAS ANDERSON  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date: September 1, 2017