1

2

## United States District Court Central District of California

1112

13

14

16

17

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

10

9

DANIEL E. VARGAS,

Plaintiff,

V.

15 JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.;

MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC

REGISTRATION SYSTEMES, INC.;

18 CITIBANK, N.A.; WILMINGTON

19 TRUST, N.A.; CALIFORNIA

20 RECONVEYANCE COMPANY; DOES

1-10, INCLUSIVE,

22 Defendants.

Case No. 5:14-cv-00859-ODW(JCGx)

ORDER STRIKING MOTION TO VOLUNTARILY DISMISS APPEAL [25]

On August 18, 2014, Plaintiff Daniel E. Vargas filed a putative Plaintiff—Appellant's Motion to Voluntarily Dismiss the Appeal Without Prejudice under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 42(b). (ECF No. 25.) But that Rule only provides for dismissal by the court of appeals—not the district court. *Contrast* Fed. R. App. P. 42(a) (allowing for dismissal by the district court but only before the appellate court dockets the appeal).

| 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

Since this Court is not the Court of Appeals, the Court cannot dismiss Vargas's appeal. The Court therefore **STRIKES** the Motion. (ECF No. 25.) Vargas may of course properly submit the Motion before the Court of Appeals.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

August 19, 2014

OTIS D. WRIGHT, II UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE