

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

‘O’

Case No.	2:16-cv-01307-CAS(AJWx)	Date	August 15, 2017
Title	PHL VARIABLE INSURANCE COMPANY v. CRESCENT FINANCIAL & INSURANCE AGENCY, INC. ET AL		

Present: The Honorable CHRISTINA A. SNYDER

Catherine Jeang

Not Present

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

Not Present

Not Present

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) - ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY CRESCENT FINANCIAL & INSURANCE AGENCY, INC.’S ANSWER SHOULD NOT BE STRICKEN (Dkt. 32, filed July 13, 2017)

On February 25, 2016, plaintiff PHL Variable Insurance Company (“PHL”) brought this action against defendants Crescent Financial & Insurance Agency, Inc. (“Crescent”) and Michael C. Monday, Crescent’s director. Dkt. 1.

On May 16, 2017, the Court found good cause to permit counsel for both Crescent and Monday to withdraw. Dkt. 27. In its May 16, 2017 order, the Court noted that Crescent, which is a corporate entity, cannot appear pro se. See L.R. 83-2.2.2. Accordingly, the Court ordered the following:

Counsel shall serve a copy of this minute order on Crescent forthwith, notifying Crescent of its obligation to obtain counsel within **thirty (30) days** of the date of this order. C.D. Cal. L.R. 83-2.3.4. Counsel shall advise Crescent that its failure to retain new counsel or otherwise respond within **thirty (30) days** may result in the imposition of sanctions or the entry of default. Counsel shall attach a copy of this order to the letter, and shall otherwise comply with all applicable rules of professional responsibility.

Dkt. 27-2.

On July 13, 2017, upon finding that Crescent failed to comply with the Court’s May 16, 2017 order, the Court ordered Crescent to show cause no later than July 28, 2017 why its answer should not be stricken and default entered against it. Dkt. 32.

