

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

<b>Case No.</b>	17-7141 DSF(JC)	<b>Date</b>	November 15, 2017
<b>Title</b>	Deutsche Bank v. Jeanette Stewart, et al.		

**Present:** The Honorable Jacqueline Chooljian, United States Magistrate Judge

Hana Rashad

None

None

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

none

none

**Proceedings:** (IN CHAMBERS) **ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE REGARDING  
REMOVING DEFENDANT’S FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ORDER  
AND TO FILE STATE ACTION COMPLAINT**

On September 27, 2017, Lisa Sharae Haney (“Removing Defendant”), who is at liberty and is representing herself, filed a Notice of Removal purporting to remove Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 17F02908 (“State Action”) to the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California. Contrary to Title 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), the Notice of Removal is not accompanied by a copy of the State Action Complaint – the initial pleading setting forth the claim for relief upon which the State Action against the Removing Defendant is based. In light of the foregoing, this Court, on October 2, 2017, ordered the Removing Defendant forthwith, and by no later than thirty (30) days from the date of such Order (*i.e.*, by November 1, 2017), to file a copy of the State Action Complaint (“October Order”). Such deadline expired more than two weeks ago and to date, Removing Defendant has failed to file a copy of the State Action Complaint or to seek an extension of time to do so.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Removing Defendant shall show cause in writing, on or before **November 27, 2017**, as to why monetary sanctions or other disciplinary measures as deemed appropriate, including denial of Removing Defendant’s pending Request to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (“IFP Request”) and/or a remand of this matter back to the Superior Court should not be imposed due to Removing Defendant’s failure to comply with the October Order and to file a copy of the State Action Complaint. **Removing Defendant is cautioned that the failure timely to comply with this Order and/or to show good cause, may result in the imposition of sanctions, including denial of the IFP Request and/or a remand of this matter back to Superior Court.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Court’s orders herein constitute non-dispositive rulings on pretrial matters. To the extent a party disagrees with such non-dispositive rulings, such party may file a motion for review by the assigned District Judge within fourteen (14) days. See Local Rule 72-2.1. To the extent a party believes the rulings to be dispositive, rather than non-dispositive, such party has the right to object to this Court’s determination that the rulings are non-dispositive within fourteen (14) days. A party will be foreclosed from challenging the rulings herein if such party does seek review thereof, or object thereto.