Case 1:17-cv-06770-AJN Document 42 Filed 12/18/17 Page 1 of 2

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Common Cause/New York,

Plaintiff,

---V---

Robert A. Brehm et al.,

Defendants.

	The state of the s
USD	CSDNY
DOC	23 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
ETA	CEROMICALITYPED
DOC	No. 7. According to the Control of t
DAT	DEC 1 8 2017
Berthalten er en	Management of the Company of the Com

17-cv-6770 (AJN)

ORDER

## ALISON J. NATHAN, District Judge:

On November 17, 2017, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss. Opposition to Defendants' motion was due on December 1, 2017, but as of December 18, 2017, Plaintiff has failed to file an opposition to Defendants' motion or request a deadline extension. Therefore, no later January 8, 2018, Plaintiff shall submit a letter to the Court indicating that it wishes to file an opposition to the motion or does not wish to file an opposition to the motion to dismiss.

If the Plaintiff indicates that it will not file an opposition brief, the Court will deem the motion fully submitted and will consider its merits. If the Plaintiff writes that it intends to file an opposition brief and is seeking an extension of the deadline to file an opposition, the Plaintiff must demonstrate in its letter that its pursuit of the action has been diligent and that there is a good reason for extending the deadline.

Failure to submit any letter to the Court by January 8, 2018 shall result in **DISMISSAL** of the action for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); *Ruzsa v. Rubenstein & Sendy Attys. at Law*, 520 F.3d 176, 178 (2d Cir. 2008) ("[I]n light of [plaintiff's] failure to respond to

## Case 1:17-cv-06770-AJN Document 42 Filed 12/18/17 Page 2 of 2

the notice threatening dismissal, it is equally unclear that a 'lesser sanction' would have proved effective in this case.").

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 2017 New York, New York

United States District Judge