

custom of the Squad caused a violation of his constitutional rights. *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs. of N.Y.C.*, 436 U.S. 658, 694 (1978). The Order advised Montgomery that if he wanted to sue individual officials who were mentioned in the text of the Complaint, he could file an amended complaint to identify them as defendants and to make a complete statement of his claims, stating specific actions that each individual defendant undertook, personally, in violation of his rights. Finally, the Order stated, "FAILURE TO SUBMIT AN AMENDED COMPLAINT MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF THE ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM." Order 2, ECF No. 10.

The time permitted for Montgomery to submit an amended complaint has elapsed, and he has had no further communication with the court and has not submitted an amended complaint. Accordingly, Montgomery has not complied with the court's Order. I will summarily dismiss this case accordingly. Because it is possible for Montgomery to cure the pleading's deficiencies and go forward with his claims in a future separate action, the dismissal will be without prejudice. See, e.g., *Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392*, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993).

A separate Final Order will be entered herewith.

DATED: December 12, 2019

/s/ James P. Jones
United States District Judge