

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

RICHARD ALLEN SMITH, JR.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civ. Action No. 11-0997 (ABJ)
)	
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT)	
OF JUSTICE <i>et al.</i>,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr style="width:40%; margin-left:0"/>)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pending before the court in this Freedom of Information Act case are defendants’ motion to dismiss or for summary judgment as to six of the seven listed defendants [Doc. # 17] and defendants’ motion for summary judgment as to the Drug Enforcement Administration [Doc. # 21]. On November 21, 2011, plaintiff was ordered to respond by January 6, 2012, to the former motion. *See* Order [Doc. # 19]. On November 22, 2011, he was ordered to respond by January 17, 2012, to the latter motion. *See* Order [Doc. # 21]. Each order warned plaintiff that his failure to respond by the respective deadline could result in the granting of the motion as conceded.

Plaintiff has neither responded to defendants’ dispositive motions nor sought additional time to respond. Hence, the Court will grant each motion as conceded and dismiss the case. *See In re Miller*, No. 03-7146, 2004 WL 963819 (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.”); *FDIC v. Bender*, 127 F.3d 58, 68 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (finding no abuse of discretion in Court’s

enforcement of local rule by “treat[ing] the FDIC's motion for summary judgment as conceded”).

A separate, final order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

_____/s/_____
AMY BERMAN JACKSON
United States District Judge

DATE: February 3, 2012