1	DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669			
2	City Attorney WAYNE SNODGRASS, State Bar #148137			
3	VINCE CHHABRIA, State Bar #208557 Deputy City Attorneys			
4	City Hall, Room 234 #1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place			
5	San Francisco, California 94102-4682 Telephone: (415) 554-4674			
6	Facsimile: (415) 554-4699 E-Mail: vince.chhabria@sfgov.org			
7				
8	Attorneys for Defendants			
9	THE CİTY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, et al.			
10				
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
13				
14	PP&M TOWING & RECOVERY, INC., a California Corporation,	Case No.	CV 10 1466 TEH	
15	Plaintiff,	CASE FO	[PROPOSED] ORDER DISMISSING CASE FOR FAILURE TO	
16	vs.	PROSEC		
17	THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN	Date: Time:	November 22, 2010 10:00 a.m.	
18	FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, a	Place:	Courtroom G, 15th Floor	
	subdivision of the State of California; and			
19	subdivision of the State of California; and GEORGE GASCON, in his capacity as the Chief of Police of the City of San			
	GEORGE GASCON, in his capacity as			
20	GEORGE GASCON, in his capacity as the Chief of Police of the City of San Francisco, California,; and DOES 1			
20 21	GEORGE GASCON, in his capacity as the Chief of Police of the City of San Francisco, California,; and DOES 1 THROUGH 20,			
20 21 22	GEORGE GASCON, in his capacity as the Chief of Police of the City of San Francisco, California,; and DOES 1 THROUGH 20,			
20 21 22 23	GEORGE GASCON, in his capacity as the Chief of Police of the City of San Francisco, California,; and DOES 1 THROUGH 20,			
20 21 22 23 24	GEORGE GASCON, in his capacity as the Chief of Police of the City of San Francisco, California,; and DOES 1 THROUGH 20,			
20 21 22 23 24 25	GEORGE GASCON, in his capacity as the Chief of Police of the City of San Francisco, California,; and DOES 1 THROUGH 20,			
19 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227	GEORGE GASCON, in his capacity as the Chief of Police of the City of San Francisco, California,; and DOES 1 THROUGH 20,			

[PROPOSED] ORDER TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE; CASE NO. CV 10 1466 TEH

On October 13, 2010, counsel for plaintiff PP&M Towing & Recovery, Inc. ("PP&M") filed a motion to withdraw on the ground that PP&M had breached its fee agreement with counsel. The motion was noticed for hearing on November 22, 2010, at 10:00 a.m. In connection with his motion, counsel testified by declaration that he had attempted repeatedly to contact his client by telephone and electronic mail regarding the alleged breach of the fee agreement, and regarding his intent to move to withdraw as counsel. Counsel testified that PP&M did not respond to these messages.

Defendant City and County of San Francisco ("City") filed a statement of non-opposition to the motion to withdraw. PP&M itself did not file a response to the motion.

On November 4, 2010, this Court issued an order directing PP&M to appear at the November 22, 2010 hearing, either through substitute counsel or by a corporate representative. The Court's order further directed that, if PP&M had not obtained substitute counsel by the date of the hearing but wished to continue pursuing the case, its corporate representative must come prepared to inform the Court of the steps the company had taken and would take to locate substitute counsel, or to present reasons why the motion by current counsel to withdraw should not be granted. Furthermore, the Court's order directed that if PP&M did not appear at the November 22, 2010 hearing, either through substitute counsel or by a corporate representative, then the Court would dismiss the case for failure to prosecute. Finally, the Court's order directed that current counsel for PP&M send a copy of the order to PP&M both by electronic mail and United States mail. Current counsel for PP&M filed a proof of service on November 4, 2010, certifying that he had served the Court's order on PP&M in accordance with the instructions of the order.

The matter came on for hearing on November 22, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. PP&M did not appear at the hearing, either through substitute counsel or through a corporate representative. Accordingly, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), and pursuant to this Court's order of November 4, 2010, the case is hereby DISMISSED for failure to prosecute.

It is so ordered.

Date: 11/23/, 2010

[PROPOSED] ORDER TO DISMISS FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE; CASE NO. CV 10 1466 TEH

