

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Khalee Moseley,

Plaintiff,

v.

District of Columbia *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 08-1880 (JDB)

**MEMORANDUM**

In this action brought *pro se* under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, plaintiff challenges the District of Columbia's alleged forfeiture and sale of his automobile. Defendants, asserting that the complaint is not ripe for review, move for summary judgment pursuant to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. By Order of March 4, 2009, plaintiff was advised about his obligation to respond to the motion by April 6, 2009, and of the possible consequence if he did not comply. By Order of June 9, 2009, the Court enlarged the time to July 13, 2009, for plaintiff to file his response and again advised plaintiff that his non-compliance could result in entry of judgment for the defendants on a conceded motion. Plaintiff has not responded to the motion or sought additional time to do so. Hence, the Court will grant defendants' motion for summary judgment as conceded.<sup>1</sup> A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum.

s/

JOHN D. BATES

United States District Judge

Dated: July 28, 2009

---

<sup>1</sup> See *In re Miller*, 2004 WL 963819, 1 (D.C. Cir., May 4, 2004) (In managing its docket under the circumstances presented, "the court may choose to . . . resolve the motion for summary judgment on the merits without an opposition . . . or [] treat summary judgment as conceded.")