

DANIEL F. BLACKERT, ESQ., CSB No. 255021
LISA J. BORODKIN, ESQ. CSB No. 196412

Asia Economic Institute
11766 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 260
Los Angeles, CA 90025
Telephone (310) 806-3000
Facsimile (310) 826-4448
Daniel@asiaecon.org
Blackertesq@yahoo.com
lisa@asiaecon.org
lisa_borodkin@post.harvard.edu

Attorneys for Plaintiffs,
Asia Economic Institute LLC,
Raymond Mobrez, and
Iliana Llaneras

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ASIA ECONOMIC INSTITUTE, a
California LLC; RAYMOND
MOBREZ an individual; and ILIANA
LLANERAS, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

XCENTRIC VENTURES, LLC, an
Arizona LLC, d/b/a as BADBUSINESS
BUREAU and/or
BADBUSINESSBUREAU.COM
and/or RIP OFF REPORT and/or
RIPOFFREPORT.COM; BAD
BUSINESS BUREAU, LLC, organized
and existing under the laws of St.
Kitts/Nevis, West Indies; EDWARD
MAGEDSON an individual, and DOES
1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:10-cv-01360-SVW-PJW

The Honorable Stephen V. Wilson

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' REQUEST TO
WAIVE ORAL ARGUMENT ON
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT AND REQUEST FOR
ENLARGMENT OF TIME TO FILE
BRIEF**

[L.R. 7-15]

Date: November 1, 2010

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Courtroom: 6

1 Plaintiffs Asia Economic Institute, LLC, Raymond Mobrez, and Iliana
2 Llaneras (“Plaintiffs”) hereby oppose Defendants’ Request to Waive Oral
3 Argument on the following grounds:

- 4 • Plaintiffs request oral argument on their opposition to the motion for
5 summary judgment.
- 6 • Plaintiffs do and have oppose Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment.
7 Plaintiffs filed declarations, request for judicial notice and a separate
8 statement in opposition, and intend to file a Rule 56(f) motion and brief.
- 9 • Defendants requested Plaintiffs to delay seeking Rule 56(f) relief, until after
10 Defendants had filed their motion for summary judgment. Plaintiffs
11 honored the request.
- 12 • Defendants agreed to shortened notice on Plaintiffs’ contemplated motion
13 under Rule 56(f) so as to preserve the November 1, 2010 hearing date.
- 14 • Defendants filed 3 additional motions during the one week that Plaintiffs
15 were given to file their opposition to the motion for summary judgment that
16 were not expressly ordered by the Court: an anti-SLAPP motion to strike
17 [DN-153] which this Court has previously denied, and two Rule 11 motions
18 [DN-157, DN-158] the Defendants previously withdrew and were stricken,
19 respectively. There is no urgency on the Rule 11 motions.
- 20 • Defendants filed a previous Rule 11 motion [DN-135], which Plaintiffs
21 briefed and opposed [DN-141]. On September 29, 2010, Defendants
22 withdrew the fully briefed Rule 11 motion [DN-155][156] and re-filed it the
23 next day, September 30, 2010 [DN-157].
- 24 • This Court had previously stricken Defendants’ other Rule 11 motion. [DN-
25 139]. Defendants refilled the previously stricken Rule 11 motion on
26 September 30, 2010. [DN-158].
- 27 • Defendants’ tactics are oppressive and appear calculated to deprive
28 Plaintiffs from an adjudication on the merits.

- 1 • Plaintiffs made a reasonable request for a brief extension of time to respond
2 to these four motions, and Defendants unreasonable refused to consent to a
3 one-week extension for the brief on the motion for summary judgment.
4 • Defendants will not be prejudiced, as Defendants’ four motions will be
5 heard on November 1, 2010, along with Plaintiffs’ contemplated motion
6 under Rule 56(f) to deny or continue the motion for summary judgment.
7 • Plaintiffs will and hereby do apply formally for a one week enlargement of
8 time to file the opposition brief on the motion for summary judgment and
9 will move to set aside any default if so required.
10

11 Dated: October 6, 2010

Respectfully Submitted,

13 /s/ Lisa J. Borodkin
14 Lisa J. Borodkin
15 Daniel F. Blackert
16 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28