

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



JS - 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MIRIAM P. AULMANN,	)	Case No. ED CV 14-02529 DDP (SPx)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<b>ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'</b>
v.	)	<b>MOTIONS TO DISMISS</b>
	)	
EAGLE IRON WORKS; ESTATE OF	)	
RALPH L. AULMANN,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	[Dkt. Nos. 11, 12]
	)	
_____	)	


Presently before the court are Defendants' Motions to Dismiss. Plaintiff has not opposed either motion. Accordingly, the court GRANTS Defendants' Motions to Dismiss and adopts the following order.

Central District of California Local Rule 7-9 requires an opposing party to file an opposition to any motion at least twenty-one (21) days prior to the date designated for hearing the motion. C.D. CAL. L.R. 7-9. Additionally, Local Rule 7-12 provides that "[t]he failure to file any required document, or the failure to file it within the deadline, may be deemed consent to the granting or denial of the motion." C.D. CAL. L.R. 7-12.

1 On December 16, 2014, Defendants noticed their motions for a  
2 hearing on March 23, 2015. The hearing was later continued to  
3 April 27, 2015. Plaintiff's oppositions were therefore due by  
4 April 6, 2015. As of the date of this Order, Plaintiff has not  
5 filed an opposition or any other filing that could be construed as  
6 a request for a continuance.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the court deems  
7 Plaintiff's failure to oppose as consent to granting the motions to  
8 dismiss, and GRANTS the motions.

9  
10  
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12  
13  
14 Dated: April 20, 2015

  
15 DEAN D. PREGERSON  
16 United States District Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

---

24 <sup>1</sup> The court notes that, prior to the transfer of this case to  
25 the undersigned, Plaintiff did file a document titled "Objections  
26 to Improper Removal." (Dkt. No. 14.) Plaintiff did not file or  
27 notice a motion to remand. Even had she done so, however, such  
28 filing would not excuse Plaintiff from the requirements of Local  
Rule 7-9. Furthermore, Plaintiff's objections regarding the amount  
in controversy do not address the Complaint's allegations that  
Plaintiff has been deprived of "one third of a multi-million dollar  
corporation."