

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV-2996 AG	Date	April 9, 2012
Title	CHARLES JEANNEL v. INDEPENDENCE BANK		

Present: The Honorable	ANDREW J. GUILFORD
-------------------------------	--------------------

Lisa Bredahl

Not Present

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Proceedings: [IN CHAMBERS] ORDER DENYING EMERGENCY MOTION

Late in the afternoon of April 9, 2012, the Court received what purports to be an “Emergency Motion for Stay Pending Appeal” (“Emergency Motion”). A title page was accompanied by a mass of other documents, filed in four separate docket entries, without explanation. (Dkt Nos. 6-9.) For many reasons, the filing provides inadequate support for the requested relief. *See, e.g., Mission Power Eng’g Co. v. Cont’l Cas. Co.*, 883 F. Supp. 488, 490 (C.D. Cal. 1995) (finding that “ex Parte motions are rarely justified”); *Fuentes v. Shevin*, 407 U.S. 67, 80-82 (1972) (due process requires that affected parties “are entitled to be heard” following “meaningful” notice, except in “extraordinary situations”); *Sniadach v. Family Fin. Corp. of Bay View*, 395 U.S. 337, 339-40 (1969) (“the right to be heard has little reality or worth unless one is informed that the matter is pending and can choose for himself whether to appear or default, acquiesce or contest”).

The Emergency Motion is DENIED.

Initials of
Preparer

_____ : _____
lmb