

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AMERICAN GENERAL LIFE	)	Case No. CV 08-06408 DDP (RZx)
INSURANCE COMPANY,	)	
	)	<b>ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION</b>
Plaintiff,	)	<b>FOR LEAVE TO FILE A FIRST AMENDED</b>
	)	<b>ANSWER AND VACATED THE MOTION TO</b>
v.	)	<b>CONSOLIDATE THREE RELATED CASES</b>
	)	<b>AS MOOT</b>
RAZMIK KHACHATOURIANS,	)	
individually and as a	)	[Docket Nos. 127, 128]
principal of LIGHTHOUSE	)	
INSURANCE MARKETING, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

Presently before the court are Defendant Brian A. Manson's: 1) Motion for Leave to File a First Amended Answer to the First Amended Complaint ("Motion to Amend"); and 2) Motion to Consolidate Three Related Cases ("Motion to Consolidate").

Plaintiff National Financial Partners Corp. is the sole remaining plaintiff in this action. As of the date of this Order, Plaintiff has not filed an opposition to either Motion, or any other filing that could be construed as a request for a continuance. Further, Defendant has submitted a Declaration indicating that Plaintiff informed Defendant that it would not

1 oppose the Motion to Amend. In Defendant's Notice of Motion to  
2 Consolidate, Defendant also states that Plaintiff had previously  
3 agreed to stipulate to consolidation.

4 Central District of California Local Rule 7-9 requires an  
5 opposing party to file an opposition to any motion at least twenty-  
6 one (21) days prior to the date designated for hearing the motion.  
7 Additionally, Local Rule 7-12 provides that "[t]he failure to file  
8 any required document, or the failure to file it within the  
9 deadline, may be deemed consent to the granting or denial of the  
10 motion." The hearings on Defendant's Motions were set for May 21,  
11 2012. Any opposition was therefore due by April 30, 2012.

12 Accordingly, pursuant to Local Rule 7-12 and in light of  
13 Defendant's representations that Plaintiff does not oppose either  
14 Motion, the court deems Plaintiff's failure to oppose as consent to  
15 granting the Motions. The court therefore GRANTS Defendant's  
16 Motion to Amend. The Court notes the three cases already have the  
17 same trial dates and vacates the Motion to Consolidate as moot.

18  
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20  
21  
22 Dated: June 18, 2012

  
DEAN D. PREGERSON  
United States District Judge

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28