

ANTHONY SCIACCA,
Plaintiff,
v.
FEDERAL BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION, *et al.*,
Defendants.

In November of 2008, plaintiff Anthony Sciacca (“Sciacca”) filed the instant pro se complaint against the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, and DOJ’s Office of Information and Privacy (collectively, “Defendants”), alleging that Defendants mishandled a document request that Sciacca submitted in 2006, pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, (“FOIA”). (*See generally* Complaint, ECF No. 1.) Defendants previously filed a motion for summary judgment, which the Court denied without prejudice on March 6, 2014, finding that “Defendants have not provided sufficient information to permit an assessment of whether they have produced all reasonably segregable information, and have also failed to submit a sufficiently detailed affidavit, declaration, or *Vaughn* index in support of Defendants’ contention that they have satisfied their FOIA obligations.” (Mem. Op., ECF No. 8, at 21.) This Court also authorized Defendants to refile their motion “[o]nce they have provided supplemental declaration, or a *Vaughn* index, in a manner consistent with this opinion.” (*Id.*)

On June 6, 2014, Defendants filed a renewed motion for summary judgment in which they again argue that certain records responsive to Sciacca's FOIA request have been properly withheld under various exemptions to the FOIA. (*See* Mem. in Supp. of Defs.' Second [] Mot. for Summ J., ECF No. 39-1.). As instructed, Defendants attached to this motion a supplemental declaration and a revised *Vaughn* index. (*See* Third Decl. of David M. Hardy and exhibits thereto, ECF Nos. 39-4, 39-5, 39-6, 39-7.)

The Court advised Plaintiff of his obligations under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the local rules of this Court to respond to the motion, and specifically warned Plaintiff that, if he did not respond to the motion by July 21, 2014, the Court could treat the motion as conceded. (Order, ECF No. 40, at 1-2). To date, Sciacca has neither filed an opposition to the motion, nor requested more time to file his opposition. The Court, therefore, will **GRANT** the United States' motion as conceded and will enter judgment in favor of Defendants. An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: October 2, 2014

Ketanji Brown Jackson
KETANJI BROWN JACKSON
United States District Judge