

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

GRAHAM SCHREIBER, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
LORRAINE LESLEY )  
DUNABIN, *et al.*, )  
)  
Defendants. )

CASE NO. 1:12-cv-852 (GBL-JFA)

**ORDER**

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Defendants Network Solutions, CentralNic Global Headquarters (“CentralNic”), ICCAN, and eNOM’s Motions to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint. (Dkt. Nos. 6, 8, 17 & 46.) Defendants Network Solutions, CentralNic, and ICANN filed their motions on September 10, 2012, each providing Plaintiff notice of its dispositive motion in accordance with Local Rule 7K and the requirements of *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975). Rather than submitting to the Court an opposition brief to Defendants’ motions, Plaintiff responded directly to the parties through written correspondence. These responses were not docketed by the Court as opposition briefs to Defendants’ motions in advance of the motions hearing. Nonetheless, a joint motions hearing was held on October 19, 2012. During the hearing, Plaintiff raised several arguments, some of which may have bearing on the disposition of Defendants’ motions. In an abundance of caution, the Court believes it is necessary for Plaintiff to fully brief the legal issues raised during the hearing and to provide Defendants an appropriate amount time to file a written response. Accordingly, it is hereby

