



1 at ¶ 8. Again she received no response through September 27, 2017, the date upon which she  
2 executed her declaration. Id. at ¶ 9. As a consequence, counsel filed the pending Ex Parte  
3 Application for a Temporary Restraining Order to prevent the noticed sale of the property that is  
4 the subject of this litigation.

5 The American Bar Association Model Rules of Professional Conduct are followed and  
6 enforced in this district court with regard to matters not covered by the California State Bar Rules  
7 of Professional Responsibility. See Local Rule 180(e). Rule 3.2 imposes upon attorneys a duty  
8 to “make reasonable efforts to expedite litigation consistent with the interests of the client. This  
9 Rule cannot be seen other than to have been abrogated by defense attorneys who refuse to  
10 respond to communications from opposing counsel resulting in the need for emergency motions  
11 that burden both opposing counsel and the court.

12 In light of the history disclosed above IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13 1. Defense Counsel Neeru Jindal and Jordan Yu shall show cause why plaintiff’s  
14 pending Application for a Temporary Restraining Order should not be granted as an unopposed  
15 motion;
- 16 2. Why other and further sanctions should not be imposed for defense counsels’  
17 failure to assist in the expedition of this litigation in an orderly manner;
- 18 3. Defense counsel shall respond to this Order to Show Cause no later than 4:00 p.m.  
19 on Monday, October 2, 2017.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 Dated: September 28, 2017

22 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28