```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 8
 9
                      EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
   ROBERT K. CYPHERS, JR.,
                                        No. 2:11-cv-01202-MCE-EFB
11
              Plaintiff,
12
13
         V.
                                         ORDER
14
   WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,
   NATIONAL CITY BANK N.A,
15
   FINANCIAL TITLE COMPANY,
   DOES 1-100,
16
              Defendants.
17
                               ----00000----
18
19
20
         Plaintiff Robert K. Cyphers Jr. ("Plaintiff") seeks redress
   from Defendants Wells Fargo Bank, National City Bank, and
21
22
   Financial Title Company ("Defendants") for alleged violations of
23
   California Civil Code Sections 2923.5 and 2924 and 15 U.S.C.
24
   Sections 1601-1667, the Truth in Lending Act ("TILA"), among
   other state causes of action.
25
26
   ///
27
   ///
28
   ///
```

Presently before the Court is a motion by Defendant Wells Fargo to dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) (ECF No. 5).

Eastern District of California Local Rule 230(c) provides that an opposition or statement of non-opposition to an opponent's motion must be filed within fourteen days preceding the noticed hearing date. The rule further provides that "[n]o party will be entitled to be heard in opposition to a motion at oral arguments if written opposition to the motion has not been timely filed by that party." Id. Failure to appear or otherwise respond may be deemed withdrawal of opposition to the motion and the Court may impose sanctions accordingly.

The original hearing for this motion was set for July 14, 2011. Plaintiff did not file a timely opposition or a statement of non-opposition pursuant to Local Rule 230(c). Nonetheless, the motion was vacated on the Court's own motion, and the hearing was continued to August 11, 2011. As of July 28, 2011, fourteen days prior to the rescheduled hearing date, Plaintiff has again failed to file an opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss.

21 ///

22 1///

23 1///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

¹ All further references to "Rule" or "Rules" are to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure unless otherwise noted.

In light of the fact that no opposition was filed by Plaintiff, Defendant's Motion to Dismiss² (Docket No. 5) is GRANTED with leave to amend. As a result of the failure to respond to the motion, within ten (10) days from the date this order is electronically filed, Plaintiff's counsel shall either (1) personally pay sanctions in the amount of \$250.00 to the Clerk of the Court³, or (2) show good cause for the failure to comply with Local Rule 230(c).

Plaintiff may file an amended complaint not later than twenty (20) days after the date this Memorandum and Order is filed electronically. If no amended complaint is filed within said twenty (20)-day period, without further notice, Plaintiff's claims will be dismissed without leave to amend.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 5, 2011

Local Rule 230(g).

MORRISON C. ENGLAND, (R.)
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Court orders this matter submitted on the briefs. E.D. Cal.

² Because oral argument will not be of material assistance, the

 $^{^{\}scriptscriptstyle 3}$ The Court is authorized to impose sanctions for failure to comply with the Local Rules. E.D. Cal. Local Rule 110.