

)	
MARGARET E. DESCHAMPS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 08-0347 (RBW)
)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

By Order of December 3, 2008 [Dkt. No. 25], the plaintiff was advised to respond to the remaining District of Columbia defendants' motion for summary judgment by January 9, 2009, or risk entry of judgment for the movants on what the Court would consider to be a conceded motion.¹ At the status conference on December 3, 2008, however, the plaintiff insisted on filing her response by December 12, 2008; thus, the Court issued an amended order advising the plaintiff to respond by that proposed deadline [Dkt. No. 26]. In addition, the Court gave the defendants until January 12, 2009, to file their reply brief and scheduled another status conference for January 22, 2009. The plaintiff has neither responded to the defendants' summary judgment motion nor sought additional time to do so. The Court therefore will grant the defendants' motion as conceded and dismiss the case. *See In re Miller*, 2004 WL 963819, 1 (D.C. Cir., May 4, 2004) (In managing its docket under the circumstances presented, "the court

¹ See Order of October 23, 2008 (granting defendant Nina Hill’s motion to dismiss).

may choose to . . . resolve the motion for summary judgment on the merits without an opposition . . . or [] treat summary judgment as conceded.”)²

s/_____
Reggie B. Walton
United States District Judge

Dated: January 21, 2009

² A separate final order accompanies this Memorandum.