

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No. 8:17-cv-706-JLS-KESx

Date: May 15, 2017

Title: Daniel Chavez v. Linebarger Goggan Blair and Sampson, LLP

---

Present: **HONORABLE JOSEPHINE L. STATON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Terry Guerrero  
Deputy Clerk

N/A  
Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

Attorneys Present for Defendant:

Not Present

Not Present

**PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF DANIEL  
CHAVEZ’S MOTION TO REMAND (Doc. 11)**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Daniel Chavez’s Motion to Remand. (Mot., Doc. 11.) For the following reasons, the Court STRIKES the Motion and VACATES the hearing set for July 14, 2017, at 2:30 p.m.

Under Local Rule 7-3, “counsel contemplating the filing of any motion shall first contact opposing counsel to discuss thoroughly, preferably in person, the substance of the contemplated motion and any potential resolution.” C.D. Cal. R. 7-3. This conference of counsel “shall take place *at least seven (7) days prior* to the filing of the motion.” *Id.* (emphasis added). If the parties are unable to resolve their differences, counsel for the moving party must include the following statement in the notice of the motion: “This motion is made following the conference of counsel pursuant to L.R. 7-3 which took place on (date).” *Id.*

The purpose of Local Rule 7-3 is to help parties “reach a resolution which eliminates the necessity for a hearing.” *Id.* Because of the importance of Local Rule 7-3 in furthering judicial economy and the administration of justice, this Court reminds counsel of their meet and confer obligations in the Court’s Initial Standing Order. (ISO ¶ 10(b), Doc. 7 (“Counsel must comply with Local Rule 7-3 . . . Counsel should discuss the issues to a sufficient degree that if a motion is still necessary, the briefing may be directed to those substantive issues requiring resolution by the Court.”).) Parties must strictly adhere to the Local Rules of this district, and a district court has the discretion to

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No. 8:17-cv-706-JLS-KESx

Date: May 15, 2017

Title: Daniel Chavez v. Linebarger Goggan Blair and Sampson, LLP

---

---

strike any motion that fails to comply with the Local Rules. *See Christian v. Mattel, Inc.*, 286 F.3d 1118, 1129 (9th Cir. 2002) (“The district court has considerable latitude in managing the parties’ motion practice and enforcing local rules that place parameters on briefing.”).

On May 10, 2017, Chavez filed the instant Motion to Remand. (Mot.) The Notice of Motion does not contain any statement that the Motion was “made following the conference of counsel pursuant to L.R. 7-3 which took place on (date).” *See C.D. Cal. R. 7-3*. The Court therefore finds that Chavez fails to satisfy the meet and confer obligations expressly set forth in Local Rule 7-3.

Accordingly, the Motion to Remand is STRICKEN.

Initials of Preparer: tg