

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  
27  
28

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

No. C 09-02565 WHA

GLORIA PINEDA,

Plaintiff,

v.

WASHINGTON MUTUAL BANK, FA,  
CALIFORNIA RECONVEYANCE  
COMPANY/ A CALIFORNIA  
CORPORATION, and DOES I-X  
INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

**ORDER DISMISSING CASE**

*Pro se* plaintiff Gloria Pineda filed a complaint in the Alameda County Superior Court of California on April 21, 2009, and the action was removed to federal court on June 9, 2009.


On June 16, 2009, defendants filed a motion to dismiss, which was noticed for a hearing on August 13, 2009. Although plaintiff's response was due on July 23, 2009, a response was not provided. Because plaintiff is *pro se*, the Court provided her additional time and extended the opposition deadline to August 12, 2009. The order warned that "[o]rdinarily, the Court would grant the motion, but the Court will provide the *pro se* plaintiff with more time. . . . Plaintiff's continued failure to respond will likely result in dismissal" (Dkt. 7). Yet again, the deadline has passed and plaintiff has not provided a response.

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  
27  
28

As described, plaintiff has repeatedly failed to respond in a timely fashion. Due to plaintiff's failure to prosecute, this action will be **DISMISSED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND**. Judgment shall be entered.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: August 17, 2009.



---

WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE