1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	Phillip Dunn,	No. CV-08-0873-PHX-NVW
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER
11	vs.	
12	) Matthew Cate, et al.,	
13	Defendants.	
14	)	
15	)	
16	Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion to Withdraw Case With Leave to Amend (doc. 62) is	
17	not really a motion to dismiss his own case but a motion to vacate the prior discovery and	
18	dispositive motion deadlines, now that Defendant has filed a Motion for Summary	
19	Judgment, and to start this case over with a new amended complaint. The motion is	
20	utterly without justification. All parties have had fair notice to prepare their case, and the	
21	opposing party would be prejudiced by allowing Plaintiff to abandon this case and start a	
22	new one. The Court's expenditure of substantial resources on this case would be wasted.	
23	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion to Withdraw	
24	Case With Leave to Amend (doc. 62) is denied.	
25	DATED this 10 <sup>th</sup> day of August, 2010.	
26		
27	Neil V. Wake	
28	United States District Judge	