

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MEHRNAZ MORTAZAVI,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOOZ ALLEN HAMILTON, INC. et
al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-07189-SB-RAO

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE
SANCTIONS

The Court's Civil Standing Order requires a party who uses generative artificial intelligence (AI) in drafting any portion of a filing to provide "a separate declaration disclosing the use of artificial intelligence and certifying that the filer has reviewed the source material and verified that the artificially generated content is accurate and complies with the filer's Rule 11 obligations."

After identifying considerable errors in Plaintiff's motion to remand, including a citation to a nonexistent case, Dkt. No. 18, the Court ordered Plaintiff to disclose whether generative AI was used in drafting the motion in accordance with the Civil Standing Order, Dkt. No. 25. In response, Plaintiff filed a declaration by her counsel revealing that counsel had used AI tools to draft the motion without filing a declaration disclosing their use. Dkt. No. 26. Counsel gives no reason for her noncompliance with the Standing Order and her thin explanation for the errors in the motion does not demonstrate that she adhered to her Rule 11 obligations.

This is Plaintiff's third violation of the Court's orders. The Court previously found that Plaintiff (and Defendant Booz Allen Hamilton) did not comply with the meet and confer requirements under the Local Rules and Standing Order and warned that further noncompliance could warrant sanctions. Dkt. No. 15. Despite

this warning, Plaintiff again violated court rules and orders. She filed her motion to remand on September 11, 2024, after meeting and conferring with Booz Allen the same day, Dkt. No. 18, contravening both the Court's order that she file the motion by September 6, Dkt. No. 14, and Local Rule 7-3, Dkt. No. 19. This late filing prompted the Court to issue a "final warning" admonishing Plaintiff for her continued noncompliance. *Id.*

Plaintiff's repeated flouting of court rules and orders is unacceptable. Plaintiff is ordered to show cause at the mandatory scheduling conference on September 27, 2024, why she and her counsel should not be sanctioned under: (1) Rule 16(f) for violating the Court's orders; and (2) Rule 11 for filing a motion without performing a reasonable inquiry into whether its legal and factual contentions are supported.

Date: September 26, 2024



Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr.
United States District Judge