

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

| | | |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| RAHEEAM PARTRIDGE, | : | |
| | : | |
| Plaintiff | : | |
| | : | NO. 5:25-CV-00311-MTT-CHW |
| VS. | : | |
| | : | |
| GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, <i>et al.</i>, | : | |
| | : | |
| Defendants | : | |

ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff Raheeam Partridge, a prisoner at the Macon State Prison in Oglethorpe, Georgia, filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. ECF No. 1. On August 26, 2025, Plaintiff was ordered to recast his complaint and provided instructions on how to do so. ECF No. 4. Plaintiff was given fourteen days to comply with the Court's order and was informed that failure to comply could result in dismissal of this action. *Id.* Plaintiff failed to respond. Therefore, on September 29, 2025, Plaintiff was ordered to show cause why this civil action should not be dismissed for failure to respond to a Court Order. ECF No. 5. Plaintiff was given fourteen days to respond or otherwise submit his recast complaint. *Id.* Plaintiff failed to file a recast complaint.

Generously, on November 4, 2025, the Court again notified Plaintiff that he failed to file a recast complaint as instructed. ECF No. 6. Plaintiff was again ordered to show cause within fourteen days why this action should not be dismissed for failure to comply with the Court's order. *Id.* The Court informed Plaintiff that this action could be

dismissed if he failed to respond to the order to show cause or otherwise file his amended complaint as instructed. *Id.* Plaintiff was given fourteen (14) days to comply with the Court's order. Plaintiff has failed to respond.

Because Plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court's orders or otherwise prosecute this case, his complaint is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); *Brown v. Tallahassee Police Dep't*, 205 F. App'x 802, 802 (11th Cir. 2006) ("The court may dismiss an action *sua sponte* under Rule 41(b) for failure to prosecute or failure to obey a court order.") (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) and *Lopez v. Aransas Cty. Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 570 F.2d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 1978)); *Duong Thanh Ho v. Costello*, 757 F. App'x 912 (11th Cir. 2018) (holding that the district court did not abuse its discretion in *sua sponte* dismissing without prejudice prisoner's *pro se* § 1983 complaint for failure to comply with court order to file amended complaint where order expressly informed prisoner of deficiencies in his complaint and rules that he needed to follow in filing amended complaint).

SO ORDERED, this 10th day of December, 2025.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell

MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT