

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



JS - 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVE DAECHUL CHOI, an individual,)	Case No. CV 09-05634 DDP (AJWx)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT
)	
v.)	[Motion filed on August 7, 2009]
)	
WASHINGTON MUTUAL, FA, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of New York; JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, FSB, a Federal Savings Bank,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter comes before the Court on a Motion to Dismiss filed by Defendant. Because Plaintiff has neither filed an Opposition nor a Notice of non-Opposition to this Motion, the Court dismisses the Complaint with prejudice.

Plaintiff Steve Daechul Choi filed this suit in Los Angeles Superior Court on June 30, 2009. His Complaint alleges causes of action for violations of (1) the Truth In Lending Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1601; (2) the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act ("RESPA"), 26 U.S.C. § 2601; (3) the Fair Housing Act ("FHA"), 42 U.S.C. § 3605;

1 (4) the Equal Credit Opportunity Act ("ECOA"); 15 U.S.C. § 1691;
2 (5) California Civil Code § 51; and (6) California Civil Code §
3 1632. In addition, Plaintiff raises causes of action for fraud,
4 breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and
5 declaratory relief. On July 31, 2009, Defendants removed the
6 action to this Court on the basis of federal question jurisdiction.
7 Thereafter, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss the complaint in
8 its entirety without leave to amend.

9 Central District of California Local Rule 7-9 requires an
10 opposing party to file an opposition or a statement of non-
11 opposition to any motion at least fourteen (14) days prior to the
12 date designated for the hearing of the motion. C.D. CAL. L.R. 7-9.
13 Additionally, Local Rule 7-12 provides that "[t]he failure to file
14 any required paper, or the failure to file it within the deadline,
15 may be deemed consent to the granting or denial of the motion."
16 C.D. CAL. L.R. 7-12.

17 The hearing on these Motions was scheduled for September 28,
18 2009. Plaintiff's Opposition or Statement of Non-Opposition was
19 therefore due by September 14, 2009. As of the date of this Order,
20 Plaintiff has not filed any response to Defendant's motion, nor any
21 other papers that could be construed as a request for an extension
22 of time to file or a request to move the hearing date. The Court
23 deems Plaintiff's failure to oppose the motion consent to granting
24 the motion and dismisses the Complaint with prejudice.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated: September 23, 2009


27 DEAN D. PREGERSON
United States District Judge

28