## 1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 8 TERI BROWN. Case No. 1:17-cv-00675-LJO-SAB 9 Plaintiff, ORDER REQUIRING ARI H. MARCUS' TO SHOW CAUSE WHY PRO HAC VICE 10 APPLICATION SHOULD NOT BE DENIED v. JONATHAN NEIL AND ASSOCIATES, (ECF No. 13) 11 INC., 12 Defendant. 13 The court has read and considered the application of Ari H. Marcus, attorney for, Plaintiff 14 Teri Brown for admission to practice Pro Hac Vice under the provisions of Local Rule 180(b)(2) 15 of the Local Rules of Practice of the United States District Court for this District. Local Rule 16 180 provides 17 18 The pro hac vice application shall be electronically presented to the Clerk and shall state under penalty of perjury . . . if the attorney has concurrently or within 19 the year preceding the current application made any other pro hac vice applications to this Court, the title and number of each action in which such 20 application was made, the date of each application, and whether each application was granted. 21 L.R. 180(b)(2)(i). 22 In the current application, counsel states under penalty of perjury that he has not 23 concurrently or within the preceding year made a pro hac vice application to this court. (ECF 24 No. 13.) However, on June 21, 2017, counsel submitted a pro hac vice application to represent 25 the same plaintiff in Brown v. Charter Communications, Inc., No. 1:17-cv-00670-LJO-JLT (E.D. 26 Cal.). Mr. Marcus' application was granted on August 30, 2017. 27 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within five (5) days of the date of entry of

28

this order, Ari H. Marcus shall show cause in writing why his pro hac vice application should not be denied for failure to comply with Rule 180. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **December 12, 2017** UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE