1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	SWECO PRODUCTS, INC.,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-11-2211 KJM-EFB
12	VS.
13	SUTTER EQUIPMENT COMPANY, INC.,
14	Defendant. <u>ORDER</u>
1 ~	
15	/
15 16	On December 20, 2011, the court ordered defendant's counsel to show cause,
	On December 20, 2011, the court ordered defendant's counsel to show cause, within fourteen days, why sanctions should not be imposed against him or his client for failure to
16	
16 17	within fourteen days, why sanctions should not be imposed against him or his client for failure to
16 17 18	within fourteen days, why sanctions should not be imposed against him or his client for failure to file a responsive pleading. (ECF 8.) Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed this case on December 22,
16 17 18 19	within fourteen days, why sanctions should not be imposed against him or his client for failure to file a responsive pleading. (ECF 8.) Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed this case on December 22, 2011. (ECF 9.) Reading between the lines, as it should not have to do, the court gathers that
16 17 18 19 20	within fourteen days, why sanctions should not be imposed against him or his client for failure to file a responsive pleading. (ECF 8.) Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed this case on December 22, 2011. (ECF 9.) Reading between the lines, as it should not have to do, the court gathers that plaintiff did not file the dismissal as promptly as defense counsel anticipated. The best practice
16 17 18 19 20 21	within fourteen days, why sanctions should not be imposed against him or his client for failure to file a responsive pleading. (ECF 8.) Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed this case on December 22, 2011. (ECF 9.) Reading between the lines, as it should not have to do, the court gathers that plaintiff did not file the dismissal as promptly as defense counsel anticipated. The best practice would have been to advise the court once the deadline passed for responding to the complaint.
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	within fourteen days, why sanctions should not be imposed against him or his client for failure to file a responsive pleading. (ECF 8.) Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed this case on December 22, 2011. (ECF 9.) Reading between the lines, as it should not have to do, the court gathers that plaintiff did not file the dismissal as promptly as defense counsel anticipated. The best practice would have been to advise the court once the deadline passed for responding to the complaint. Nevertheless, in light of dismissal of the case, the order to show cause is discharged.
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ol>	within fourteen days, why sanctions should not be imposed against him or his client for failure to file a responsive pleading. (ECF 8.) Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed this case on December 22, 2011. (ECF 9.) Reading between the lines, as it should not have to do, the court gathers that plaintiff did not file the dismissal as promptly as defense counsel anticipated. The best practice would have been to advise the court once the deadline passed for responding to the complaint. Nevertheless, in light of dismissal of the case, the order to show cause is discharged.
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	within fourteen days, why sanctions should not be imposed against him or his client for failure to file a responsive pleading. (ECF 8.) Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed this case on December 22, 2011. (ECF 9.) Reading between the lines, as it should not have to do, the court gathers that plaintiff did not file the dismissal as promptly as defense counsel anticipated. The best practice would have been to advise the court once the deadline passed for responding to the complaint. Nevertheless, in light of dismissal of the case, the order to show cause is discharged. DATED: January 10, 2012.
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ol>	within fourteen days, why sanctions should not be imposed against him or his client for failure to file a responsive pleading. (ECF 8.) Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed this case on December 22, 2011. (ECF 9.) Reading between the lines, as it should not have to do, the court gathers that plaintiff did not file the dismissal as promptly as defense counsel anticipated. The best practice would have been to advise the court once the deadline passed for responding to the complaint. Nevertheless, in light of dismissal of the case, the order to show cause is discharged. DATED: January 10, 2012.