

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
EVANSVILLE DIVISION

JAMES HAYES,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) 3:16-cv-00050-RLY-MPB
)
MARY RICHIE,)
)
Defendant.)

**ORDER ON DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON
THE PLEADINGS and MOTION FOR SUMMARY RULING**

Defendant, Mary Richie, moved for judgment on the pleadings pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c). When Plaintiff, James Hayes, failed to respond, Defendant moved for a summary ruling pursuant to the court’s local rules. *See* S.D. Ind. L.R. 7-1(c)(4) (“The court may summarily rule on a motion if an opposing party does not file a response within the deadline.”).

As the Seventh Circuit has made clear, “[W]hen presented with a motion to dismiss, the nonmoving party must proffer some legal basis to support his cause of action. The federal courts will not invent legal arguments for litigants.” *Stransky v. Cummins Engine Co.*, 51 F.3d 1329, 1335 (7th Cir. 1995) (citation omitted). Put another way, “Our system of justice is adversarial, and our judges are busy people. If they are given plausible reasons for dismissing a complaint, they are not going to do the plaintiff’s research and try to discover whether there might be something to say against the defendants’ reasoning.” *Kirksey v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.*, 168 F.3d 1039, 1041 (7th

Cir. 1999) (*quoted in G&S Holdings LLC v. Cont'l Cas. Co.*, 697 F.3d 534, 538 (7th Cir. 2012)). Because Plaintiff failed to muster any opposition to the motion for judgment on the pleadings, his Complaint shall be dismissed forthwith. Therefore, Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (Filing No. 14) and Motion for Entry of Summary Ruling (Filing No. 16) are both **GRANTED**.

SO ORDERED this 19th day of July 2016.



RICHARD L. YOUNG, CHIEF JUDGE
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana

Distributed Electronically to Registered Counsel of Record.

Distributed via U.S. Mail:

James Hayes
803 W. Broadway St., C4
Princeton, IN 47670