

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

DARNELL STANLEY,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 13-0430 (RC)
	)	
ISAAC FULWOOD, JR., <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Pending before the court is Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment [Dkt. # 8]. On July 12, 2013, plaintiff Darnell Stanley was advised to respond to the motion by August 12, 2013, or risk summary dismissal of the case. *See* Order [Dkt. # 10]. Mr. Stanley was granted additional time to September 9, 2013, and was again warned of the potential consequence of dismissal if he did not respond. *See* Aug. 6, 2013 Min. Order. Mr. Stanley has not complied with the orders and has not sought additional time to do so. Hence, this case will be dismissed on what is considered to be a conceded motion to dismiss. *See Twelve John Does v. District of Columbia*, 117 F.3d 571, 577 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (“Where the district court relies on the absence of a response as a basis for treating a motion as conceded, [the District of Columbia Circuit] honor[s] its enforcement” of the local rule); *accord Fox v. Am. Airlines, Inc.*, 389 F.3d 1291, 1294-95 (D.C. Cir. 2004); *FDIC v. Bender*, 127 F.3d 58, 67-68 (D.C. Cir. 1997). A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
RUDOLPH CONTRERAS  
United States District Judge

Dated: October 16, 2013