

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	EDCV 17-00379 AG (ASx)	Date	June 20, 2018
Title	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ex rel. LOUIS J. JEAN-LOUIS v. CITY OF RIVERSIDE		

---

Present: The Honorable ANDREW J. GUILFORD

Lisa Bredahl

Not Present

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

**Proceedings: [IN CHAMBERS] ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Fundamentally, this case is about whether Defendants, the City of Riverside and various City of Riverside employees, “obtain[ed] federal grant money from the Department of Housing and Development . . . under false pretenses.” (Compl., Dkt. No. 1 at ¶ 1.) Relator Louis J. Jean-Louis filed this case on behalf of the United States Government under the False Claims Act back in March 2017. Since then, the Relator hasn’t lived up to the duty to pursue the “just, speedy, and inexpensive determination” of this case. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

On December 8, 2017, the United States Government declined to intervene in this case. (Dkt. No. 11.) Then nothing happened. So over three months later, the Court ordered the Relator to show cause “why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution” on March 22, 2018. (Dkt. No. 13.) More than two weeks after that, the Relator filed a response, saying that the Relator was “in the process of serving defendants” and asking for an additional 30 days to complete service. (Dkt. No. 14.) On May 5, 2018—more than a year after originally filing the complaint with the Court—the Relator finally filed a batch of proofs of service. (Dkt. Nos. 20–35.) The Relator has continued to file proofs of service as recently as June 13, 2018. (Dkt. Nos. 40–41.)

The problems with the Relator’s participation in this case don’t end there. On May 23, 2018,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	EDCV 17-00379 AG (ASx)	Date	June 25, 2018
Title	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ex rel. LOUIS J. JEAN-LOUIS v. CITY OF RIVERSIDE		

Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the Relator’s complaint for various reasons, including immunity, preclusion, and untimely service. (Mot., Dkt. No. 35.) Defendants say they tried to contact the Relator’s counsel to meet and confer before filing the motion, sending him three letters and calling him. But the Relator’s attorney “ignored and never responded to any of these communications, and has made no effort to communicate with defense counsel.” (*Id.* at ii–iii.) When the Relator finally filed a brief opposition to Defendants’ motion to dismiss (ten days late), the Relator made no effort to explain (a) why the motion was late or (b) why the Relator’s counsel failed to meet and confer with Defendants’ counsel. (*See* Opp’n, Dkt. No. 42.)

The Court is concerned that the adversarial process has broken down here, driven primarily by the Relator’s ineffective approach to this case. Consequently, the Court **ORDERS** the Relator to show cause at the hearing on **June 25, 2018, at 10:00am**, why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute this case, failure to follow Court orders, and failure to follow this Court’s Local Rules and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court **CAUTIONS** the Relator that failure to show cause may result in sanctions, including monetary sanctions and dismissal.

	:	0
Initials of Preparer		<hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 5px;"/> lmb <hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-top: 5px;"/>