

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FRIEDA MAE ROGERS, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
WILMINGTON TRUST COMPANY, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:17-cv-00392-AWI-SAB
ORDER GRANTING REQUEST FOR
REFUND OF FILING FEE FOR PRO HAC
VICE APPLICATION OF THOMAS L.
ALLEN
(ECF No. 25)

On June 28, 2017, Thomas L. Allen, attorney for Defendants, filed an application for admission to practice pro hac vice under the provisions of Local Rule 180(b)(2) of the Local Rules of Practice of the United States District Court for this District. (ECF No. 20.) Upon review of Mr. Allen’s application the Court found that he was admitted to practice in California on July 29, 2003. (ECF No. 20 at 2.)

Since it was unclear to the Court why an attorney who is an active member of the State Bar of California and eligible to practice law in California would seek admission pro hac vice in this case instead of seeking admission to the Bar of this Court, an order issued requiring Mr. Allen to explain why he was seeking admission pro hac vice in this case instead of seeking admission to the Bar of this Court. On July 5, 2017, Mr. Allen filed a response stating that he is no longer seeking admission pro hac vice and that he has submitted a petition for admission to this Court. (ECF No. 23.) On July 10, 2017, the Court denied Mr. Allen’s pro hac vice

1 application. (ECF No. 24.)

2 On August 2, 2017, Defendants filed a request for a refund of the application fee
3 submitted to the Court in connection with the pro hac vice application of Mr. Allen. (ECF No.
4 25.) Defendants indicate that Mr. Allen has submitted the required fee in connection with his
5 petition for admission pursuant to Local Rule 180(a)(1).

6 Local Rule 180(b)(2)(iii) provides that the Court may refund any or all of the fee paid by
7 the attorney if the pro hac vice application is denied. As Mr. Allen's application was denied
8 because he is already a member of the Bar of the State of California and he has now submitted a
9 petition for admission and the required fee for that petition, the \$225 fee paid in connection with
10 the pro hac vice application of Mr. Allen shall be refunded.

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the \$225 fee (receipt number 0972-
12 7132863) paid in connection with the pro hac vice application of Thomas L. Allen shall be
13 refunded.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: August 4, 2017


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28