

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

PEDRO A. BRAMBILA, and
DOMINGA BRAMBILA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

REO BAY AREA, LP; ROBIN
TRIPALDI; KIMBALL, TIREY,
& ST. JOHN LLP; DOES 1
THROUGH 10,

Defendants.

No. C 11-03202 SI

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S
MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT**

On September 9, 2011, the Court granted defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint, with limited leave to amend. Following that order, the plaintiffs filed an amended opposition to defendants' motion to dismiss. The Court has received and reviewed that filing. The arguments presented in the amended opposition do not address the analysis behind the dismissal -- that is, the Court's lack of subject matter jurisdiction over the complaint. In sum, the amended opposition does not change anything.

The action is still dismissed, and the plaintiffs are still given leave to amend the complaint only to the extent that they may attempt to allege claims against defendants which are "debt collectors" within the meaning of the FDCPA in order to establish the Court's jurisdiction. **The plaintiffs are given until September 30, 2011 to file the amended complaint on this limited basis.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 12, 2011



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge