

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

ERNEST L. DIXON,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Civil Action No.: 10-1491 (RMU
	:	
	:	Re Document No. : 3
	:	
SIXTEEN HUNDRED PENNSYLVANIA	:	
AVENUE POLICE,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

**GRANTING THE DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO DISMISS AS CONCEDED**

This matter is before the court on the defendant’s motion to dismiss. On September 1, 2010, the *pro se* plaintiff filed a handwritten one-page complaint against “Sixteen Hundred Pennsylvania Avenue Police.” *See generally* Compl. In his complaint, the plaintiff states that he

is suing the Sixteen Hundred Pen[n]sylvania Avenue Police for \$999,000,000,000,000,000.00 for harassment, searching me on my property and depriving me of my mansion to wit[]: Sixteen Hundred Pen[n]sylvania Avenue Washington, E.D. without due process of law[.] Also I am suing the said for the [amount] of \$999,000,000,000,000,000.00 for punitive damages.

Compl. at 1.

On November 1, 2010, the Secret Service filed a motion to dismiss the plaintiff’s complaint.<sup>1</sup> *See generally* Secret Service’s Mot. to Dismiss. The same day, the court issued a *Fox-Neal* order directing the plaintiff to respond to the pending motion to dismiss by November 22, 2010 and advising the plaintiff that his failure to respond to the motion could result in the court deeming the matter conceded. Order (Nov. 1, 2010).

---

<sup>1</sup> There is no entity known as the “Sixteen Hundred Pennsylvania Avenue Police.” Secret Service’s Mot. to Dismiss at 1. Because, however, the Secret Service is responsible for protection of the White House, which is located at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, it is presumed that the plaintiff intended to sue the Secret Service. *See id.*

To date, the plaintiff has not responded to the motion to dismiss. His failure to do so permits the court to treat the motion as conceded. *Fox v. Am. Airlines, Inc.*, 389 F.3d 1291, 1294-95 (D.C. Cir. 2004). Accordingly, the court grants the motion to dismiss. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is separately and contemporaneously issued this 30th day of November, 2010.

RICARDO M. URBINA  
United States District Judge