


**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Richmond Division**



SUNDARI K. PRASAD,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. **3:17CV66**

SHAKITA MASSEY-TAYLOR, et al.,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, a Virginia inmate proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, submitted this civil action and filed a particularized complaint. However, in her particularized complaint, Plaintiff failed to allege facts sufficient to support a viable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983¹ against each listed defendant.

Accordingly, by Memorandum Order entered on July 21, 2017, the Court provided detailed instructions on how to particularize her complaint and directed her to submit a second particularized complaint within fourteen (14) days of the date of entry thereof. (ECF No. 12.) The Court warned Plaintiff that the failure to submit the second particularized complaint would result in the dismissal of the action. (*Id.* at 2.)

Instead of filing a second particularized complaint, on July 28, 2017, Plaintiff filed a

¹ That statute provides, in pertinent part:


Every person who, under color of any statute . . . of any State . . . subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law

42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Motion for Appointment of Counsel. (ECF No. 14.) By Memorandum Order entered on August 2, 2017, the Court denied Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel and ordered her to file her second particularized complaint within eleven (11) days of the date of entry thereof. (ECF No. 15, at 1–2.) The Court again warned Plaintiff that the failure to submit the second particularized complaint would result in the dismissal of the action. (*Id.* at 2.) More than eleven (11) days have elapsed since the entry of the August 2, 2017 Memorandum Order. Plaintiff failed to submit a second particularized complaint or otherwise respond to the August 2, 2017 Memorandum Order. Accordingly, the action will be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

An appropriate order will accompany this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: **SEP 29 2017**
Richmond, Virginia


M. Hannah Lauck
United States District Judge