

continued to file pleadings and papers in his other active cases and appeals, while he was claiming to be unable to do any legal work in this case [see www.pacer.gov]. Second, on October 14, 2010, Windsor filed in this case a 3,550+ page Thirty-Fifth Declaration of William M. Windsor [159]. Windsor's inability to meet the original August 18, 2010, filing deadline in this case was attributable to his heavy *pro se* caseload, rather than to his medical condition. As Windsor himself wrote: "Windsor's August [was] filled with catch-up filings in other matters" [127, Ex. B at 4]. While it was Windsor's prerogative to focus his efforts on cases pending in other courts, having made that choice, Windsor was not – and is not – entitled to a stay in this case because his *pro se* caseload has grown so large that it has overwhelmed him.

III. Discussion.

This Court now turns to the two pending motions to dismiss and Windsor's partial response. All defendants in this case other than the United States and Judge Evans filed a motion to dismiss [131] to which Windsor did not respond. This Court's Local Rules provide that: "Failure to file a response shall indicate that there is no opposition to [a] motion." LR 7.1.B, NDGa. Because Windsor failed to respond to that motion to dismiss, it will be granted.