

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHARI NEWMAN,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-11-1780 KJM-DAD

vs.

WASHINGTON MUTUAL HOME LOANS;  
et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

On August 22, 2011, the court ordered plaintiff to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed against her or her counsel for her failure to comply with Local Rule 230(c) and file an opposition or statement of non-opposition to defendant’s motion to dismiss. (ECF 8.) Plaintiff responded on August 24, 2011. (ECF 9.) On September 16, 2011, the court issued an order granting plaintiff fourteen (14) days from its filing to file an amended complaint and stated that failure to do so would result in the closure of this case. (ECF 10.) Plaintiff has failed to file an amended complaint. On January 24, 2012, defendant moved for dismissal for lack of prosecution. (ECF 11.)

It has come to the court’s attention that plaintiff’s counsel, Piotr Gabriel Reysner, is no longer eligible to practice law in California. The court hereby takes judicial notice of Reysner’s ineligibility, although Reysner failed to notify the court of this change in status as

1 required by Local Rule 184. The court is justifiably concerned with the status of the case and the  
2 extent of plaintiff's knowledge regarding the status of Reysner's license.

3 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED:

4 1) Reysner will provide the court, within fourteen (14) days of the entry of this  
5 order, with plaintiff's current mailing address and phone number;

6 2) Reysner will show cause, within fourteen (14) days of the filing of this order,  
7 why he should not be sanctioned in the amount of \$150.00 for his failure to notify the court of  
8 his ineligibility to practice as required by Local Rule 184; and

9 3) Hearing on defendant's motion to dismiss, set for February 24, 2012, is vacated  
10 to be reset as necessary upon the court's receipt of a response to this order from Reysner or the  
11 expiration of the fourteen (14) days allotted him to comply with this order.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 DATED: February 13, 2012.

14  
15   
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26