

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

GLOBAL ACQUISITIONS NETWORK,)	Case No. CV 12-08758 DDP (CWx)
a Wyoming corporation; SHAWN)	
CORNEILLE, an individual,)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS
)	ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
Plaintiff,)	FOR FAILURE TO STATE A PLAUSIBLE
)	CLAIM
v.)	
)	
BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION,)	
a Delaware corporation;)	
ORIANA CAPITAL PARTNERS, LLC,)	
a Connecticut limited)	
liability company; ZANCO, a)	
company of unknown business)	
form, HLB FINANCIAL, LLC, a)	
company of unknown form; W/C)	
INVESTMETN HOLDINGS INC., a)	
Florida corporatin;)	
DEXTER)	
CHAPPELL, an individual;)	
VALERIE CHAPPELL, an)	
individual; JON LEARY, an)	
individual; GLEN McINERNEY)	
also known as LARRY BENNETT,)	
an individual; CHRISTOPHER)	
RAY ZANCO, an individual;)	
BERNARD WOODSON, an)	
individual,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

As previously noted, the Court "has serious doubts about the plausibility of the scenario alleged by Plaintiffs" (Docket No. 38,

1 p. 6). Plaintiffs seek over \$31 million dollars in total damages
2 based on pleaded facts that this Court seriously doubts actually
3 occurred. (FAC, Docket No. 48. Specifically, the Court is dubious
4 that anyone would agree, as Plaintiffs allege they did, to depart
5 with something of high value based on oral representations made by
6 an unknown individual over the phone. Further, though the "face
7 value" of the CMOs is allegedly billions of dollars, they may in
8 fact be worthless. Those doubts have not been alleviated through
9 the course of the litigation. As a result, the Court has declined
10 to enter a default judgment against any Defendant in this action.
11 Further, Plaintiffs' counsel has requested and been granted
12 withdrawal from this action, which adds to the Court's concern
13 about the legitimacy of the underlying claims. (Docket No. 117.)

14 Therefore, the Court issues this order to Plaintiffs to show
15 cause why this action should not be dismissed as implausible.
16 Plaintiffs are ordered to file a brief, not to exceed five pages,
17 by January 17, 2014, showing cause why this action should not be
18 dismissed as implausible. The brief must be accompanied by a
19 declaration attesting to the facts contained in the brief, signed
20 under penalty of perjury. Failure to file a response will result in
21 dismissal of this action with prejudice.

22

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24

25 Dated: December 27, 2013

26


DEAN D. PREGERSON
United States District Judge

27

28