21

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

```
1
 2
 3
 4
5
6
7
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8
9
                       CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
   MYRA M. RITCHIE,
                                      Case No. CV 09-02484 DDP (JWJx)
11
12
                   Plaintiff,
                                      ORDER ACCEPTING PLAINTIFF'S LATE-
13
                                      FILED OPPOSITION, VACATING
         v.
                                      HEARING, AND SETTING DUE DATE FOR
   COMMUNITY LENDING
                                      DEFENDANTS' REPLY BRIEFS
   CORPORATION, a California
15
   corporation; FIRST AMERICAN
                                      [Motions filed on:
   TITLE COMPANY, a California
                                      [05-12-09
16
   corporation; QUALITY LOAN
                                      [05-13-09
   SERVICE CORPORATION, a
                                      [06-10-09
17
                                      [06-24-09
   California corporation,
18
                   Defendants.
19
20
        Having considered Plaintiff's request to late-file her
```

Having considered Plaintiff's request to late-file her
Opposition to Defendants' Motions to Dismiss and Defendants'
Oppositions to that request, the Court accepts Plaintiff's latefiled Opposition in order to consider Defendants' Motion to Dismiss
on the merits. Although the Court generally will not reward the
late filings of a party who has had significant time and has failed
to show good cause, the Court prefers, in this instance, to deal
with the Motion to Dismiss on the merits. In the future, should
Plaintiff need more time to respond to a filing, Plaintiff should

seek a stipulation from opposing counsel to continue the hearing date or file an ex parte application with the court seeking an extension before Plaintiff's filing is due. The Court specifically warns Plaintiff's counsel that failure to comply with Court orders and Local Rules will not be tolerated in the future, and may lead to sanctions.

The Court also vacates the hearing date for all four motions, which will be decided without oral argument. Additionally, in light of Plaintiff's tardy filing, the Court orders that Defendants' Reply briefs, should they choose to file them, are now due Monday, July 13, 2009. The Court reminds the parties that mandatory chambers copies of such papers should be delivered to 312 N. Spring Street, Room 244-J, Los Angeles, CA 90012. IT IS SO ORDERED.

15

16

18

19

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Dated: July 1, 2009

17

DEAN D. PREGERSON

United States District Judge

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28