

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
GEORGIA, VALDOSTA DIVISION

Frances Hood and Matthew A. Williams v. Mayor Ronelle Searcy

Hood · No. 7:25-cv-184-WLS · Decided March 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia provides pro se plaintiffs Frances Hood and Matthew A. Williams notice and an opportunity to respond to Defendants’ motion to dismiss. The Court permits each plaintiff to file an individual brief of no more than twenty pages within twenty-one days, or by March 31, 2026, and warns that failure to respond may result in dismissal without further notice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Valdosta Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	W. Louis Sands, Sr. Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Valdosta Division
DECIDED	March 10, 2026
DOCKET	7:25-cv-184-WLS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order notifying pro se plaintiffs of the pending motion to dismiss and providing them an opportunity to respond before the court rules on the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For purposes of a motion to dismiss, the court accepts as true the factual allegations in the complaint and requires sufficient factual allegations to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence supporting the claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential interlocutory procedural order

TOPICS

[motions to dismiss](#)

[standing](#)

[pleadings](#)

[subject matter jurisdiction](#)

[civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether pro se plaintiffs should be given an opportunity to respond to the pending motion to dismiss before the court rules on it.
2. What pleading standard governs the court's consideration of the motion to dismiss.
3. Whether the motion seeks dismissal of Matthew A. Williams for lack of standing under Rule 12(b)(1) and dismissal for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6).

HOLDINGS

1. The court permitted each pro se plaintiff to file an individual brief opposing the motion to dismiss within twenty-one days, after which the court would consider the motion and any opposition before issuing a ruling.
2. In considering the motion to dismiss, the court accepts as true the facts alleged in the complaint, but the complaint must contain factual allegations raising a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence supporting the claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“As Plaintiffs are proceeding pro se, the Court shall permit them an opportunity to file a Response to the Motion to Dismiss, if they so desire, within twenty-one (21) days of this Order or no later than Tuesday, March 31, 2026.”

“Plaintiffs are also noticed that since they only represent themselves individually as pro se Plaintiffs, they must file their individual response, not a single response on behalf of both.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Frances Hood and Matthew A. Williams, proceeding pro se, filed a First Amended Complaint against Mayor Ronelle Searcy. Defendants moved to dismiss under Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6), including an argument that Williams lacks standing. The court had not yet resolved the motion and issued this order to provide the pro se plaintiffs notice and an opportunity to respond.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint on February 18, 2026. Defendants refiled a motion to dismiss under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) on March 4, 2026. The court directed each pro se plaintiff to file an individual response within twenty-one days and stated that it would decide the motion after considering the motion and any opposition.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Griffith v. Wainwright, 772 F.2d 822 (11th Cir. 1985) (per curiam)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 556 (2007)
- Wilchombe v. TeeVee Toons, Inc., 555 F.3d 949, 959 (11th Cir. 2009)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-middle-district-of-geor/2026/frances-hood-and-matthew-a-williams-v-mayor-ronelle-searcy-uef62caf>