

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

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Faye Myrette-Crosley,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
Mortg. Elec. Registration Sys., Inc., et al.,  
Defendants.

NO. C 11-05660 JW

**ORDER DISCHARGING ORDER TO  
SHOW CAUSE; TERMINATING CASE**

On February 23, 2012, based on Plaintiff’s prior multiple dismissals of Defendants in this action, the Court dismissed Plaintiff’s claims against Defendants Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. (“MERS”), Clarion Mortgage Capital, Inc. (“Clarion”), MTC Financial dba Trustee Corps (“Trustee Corps”), Indymac Federal Bank, F.S.B. (“IndyMac”) and OneWest Bank, F.S.B. (“OneWest”). (hereafter, “February 23 Order,” Docket Item No. 29.) The Court also ordered Plaintiff to show cause as to why her claim against Defendant Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (“Federal Home Loan”) should not be dismissed. (See id.) Also on February 23, 2012, the Court received a Notice of Voluntary Dismissal in which Plaintiff voluntarily dismisses all claims against Defendants Federal Home Loan, MERS, and OneWest.<sup>1</sup> (See Docket Item No. 28.)

In light of Plaintiff’s dismissal of the only remaining Defendant in this case, Defendant Federal Home Loan, the Court DISCHARGES the Order to Show Cause as to Plaintiff’s claim against Defendant Federal Home Loan and VACATES the hearing set for March 12, 2012. For the


---

<sup>1</sup> For reasons discussed in the Court’s February 23 Order, Plaintiff’s claims as to Defendants OneWest and MERS were barred by res judicata.

1 reasons stated in the February 23 Order as to those Defendants that have been voluntarily dismissed  
2 by Plaintiff, the Court finds that Plaintiff's Notice of Voluntary Dismissal against Defendant Federal  
3 Home Loan is with prejudice, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41.<sup>2</sup>

4 No claims remain in this case. Judgment shall be entered accordingly.

5  
6  
7 Dated: February 23, 2012

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES WARE  
United States District Chief Judge

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>2</sup> (See February 23 Order at 2-4 (describing procedural history of case and application of  
28 Rule 41 to Plaintiff's multiple dismissals).)

1 **THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:**

2 Charles William Nunley charles.nunley@sierralawgroup.net  
3 Richard Joseph Reynolds rreynolds@trlawyers.com  
4 Timothy Lee McCandless tmvictorvillelaw@gmail.com  
5 William Guy Malcolm bill@mclaw.org

6 **Dated: February 23, 2012**

**Richard W. Wieking, Clerk**

7 **By:           /s/ JW Chambers**  
8 **Susan Imbriani**  
9 **Courtroom Deputy**

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28