

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

ANDREW APPLEWHAITE,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Civil Action No.: 09-2195
	:	
v.	:	
	:	Re Document No.: 15
MATTHEW SHINTON <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**MEMORANDUM O R D E R**

**DIRECTING THE PLAINTIFF TO RESPOND TO THE DEFENDANTS' MOTION**

In this case, the defendants have filed a motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, for summary judgment. To date, the *pro se* plaintiff has not responded.

Providing *pro se* litigants with the necessary knowledge to participate effectively in the trial process is important. *Moore v. Agency for Int'l Dev.*, 994 F.2d 874, 876 (D.C. Cir. 1993). Although district courts do not need to provide detailed guidance to *pro se* litigants, they should supply minimal notice of the consequences of not complying with procedural rules. *Id.*

Toward that end, the court hereby notifies the plaintiff that failure to respond to the defendants' motion to dismiss may result in the court granting the motion and dismissing the case. *McCoy v. Read*, 2003 WL 21018864, at \*1 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 29, 2003) (per curiam). Specifically, Local Civil Rule 7(b) states that a party must respond with a memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to a motion within 11 days of the date of service or at such other time as the court may direct. LCvR 7(b). And Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(d) allows for an additional 3 days to file a response. FED. R. CIV. P. 6(d). If such a memorandum is not filed within the prescribed time, the court may treat the motion as conceded. LcvR 7(b).

Accordingly, to give the plaintiff an opportunity to respond to the defendant's motion, it

is this 11th day of January, 2012,

**ORDERED** that the plaintiff may file an opposition to the defendants' motion on or before February 20, 2012. If the plaintiff fails to file an opposition by that date, the court may treat the defendants' motion as conceded.

**SO ORDERED.**

RICARDO M. URBINA  
United States District Judge