22

23

24

25

26

27

28

```
1
2
3
4
5
                    IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6
7
                   FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8
9
   VISTAR CORPORATION, A Colorado
   corporation,
10
                                             2:09-cy-02220-GEB-GGH
                   Plaintiff,
11
                                             ORDER FINDING NATIONAL BANK
                                             OF ARIZONA HAS NOT
              v.
12
                                             SUFFICIENTLY COMPLIED WITH
                                             LOCAL RULE 6-144(e)
   SIERRA VALLEY RESTAURANTS, INC., a
13
   corporation also known as Jack in
   the Box;
             CENTRAL VALLEY
14
   SERVICE, INC., a corporation also
   known as Jack in the Box;
15
   FOODSERVICE MANAGEMENT, INC., a
   corporation also known as Jack in
16
   the Box; KOBRA ASSOCIATES, INC.,
   a corporation also known as Jack
17
   in the Box; ABE ALIZADEH, an
   individual; NATIONAL BANK OF
18
   ARIZONA, Notice of Related Cases by)
   Plaintiff in 2:08-cv-02998-GEB-GGH)
19
                   Defendants.
20
21
```

On August 26, 2009, National Bank of Arizona ("NBA") filed an emergency ex parte application concerning its motion to intervene and request to brief a pending motion for a preliminary injunction. Under Local Rule 6-144(e), "Ex parte applications to shorten time will not be granted except upon affidavit of counsel showing a satisfactory explanation for the need . . . of such an order and for the failure of counsel to obtain a stipulation for the issuance of such an order from other counsel . . . "

NBA has been aware of the pendency of this action since August 11, 2009, yet waited until today to file the emergency application. (Decl. of Ray Sardo ¶ 7.) NBA's counsel indicates in a declaration that the ex parte relief NBA seeks is justified since counsel left a telephone recorded message with each counsel involved in this action about NBA's emergency application at about 3:30 p.m. yesterday, yet made no other attempt to obtain a stipulation from other counsel. (Decl. of Ray Sardo ¶ 12-15.) This is not a satisfactory explanation for either the need of an emergency order or for the failure to obtain a stipulation prescribed in Rule 6-144(e). Therefore, NBA's application is denied.

All counsel (including NBA through its counsel) shall confer regarding what NBA seeks to do. This conference should obviate the need for the emergency relief NBA appears bent on seeking if counsel can not arrive at a reasonable solution.

Dated: August 26, 2009

United States District Judge