

parties of make predaing antenanients was successful view of the appendix of complaint
have been dismissed against defendants American Home Mortgage Servicing, Inc. and Mortgage
Electronic Registration System, Inc., the action was dismissed with prejudice as to those
defendants.

Defendant T.D. Service Company ("T.D. Service") is the sole remaining defendant. Defendant filed a declaration of non-monetary status on February 7, prior to removal of this action to federal court. Section 2924l provides that where "a trustee under a deed of trust is

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

named in an action or proceeding in which that deed of trust is the subject, and in the event that the trustee maintains a reasonable belief that it has been named in the action or proceeding solely in its capacity as trustee, and not arising out of any wrongful acts or omissions on its part in the performance of its duties as trustee, then, at any time, the trustee may file a declaration of nonmonetary status." Cal. Civ. Code § 29241.

Although this Court has held that Section 2924l declarations are generally not valid in federal court proceedings, it has treated a defendant as a nominal defendant where the parties have stipulated to non-monetary status. *Avila v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No. 12-CV-01237, Dkt. No. 22 (N.D. Cal. May 21, 2012) (Alsup, J.). By order dated July 9, the Court ordered a stipulation of non-monetary status to be filed as to defendant T.D. Service by July 23; if no such stipulation was filed by that date, plaintiff was ordered to show cause why the reasons for dismissing the action stated in the dismissal order do not also apply to the claims alleged against T.D. Service. No stipulation was filed and plaintiff has not filed a statement showing cause.

14 The complaint alleges that T.D. Service was trustee of record at the time the Notice of 15 Default on the subject property was recorded. All of plaintiff's claims against defendant T.D. 16 Service, as well as the operative facts, are identical to those alleged against defendants American 17 Home Mortgage Servicing, Inc. and Mortgage Electronic Registration System, Inc. Plaintiff has 18 not sought leave to amend the complaint or shown cause why the April 23 dismissal order should 19 not also apply to claims alleged against T.D. Service. Accordingly, because the claims against 20 T.D. Service are no different than the dismissed claims against the other two defendants and 21 plaintiff has made no showing to the contrary, the action is **DISMISSED WITHOUT LEAVE TO** 22 AMEND as against defendant T.D. Service. As there are no remaining claims against any 23 defendant, judgment will be entered. Plaintiff is advised that she may appeal the dismissal of 24 this action to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit but must file a notice of appeal within 30 25 days of the entry of judgment against her.

26

28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

27 Dated: September 4, 2012.

Ahr

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE