

Defendant Patrick Lyman & Associates LLC filed a motion to dismiss the third amended 18 complaint on July 16, 2013. (Dkt. No. 132.) Prior to the hearing on the motion to dismiss, 19 Defendant filed a notice that it had entered a written settlement agreement with Plaintiffs. (Dkt. 20 No. 144.) The Notice stated that Plaintiffs were required to file a dismissal with the Court by 21 August 20, 2013. As of the date of this Order, however, no dismissal has been filed. Accordingly, 22 Plaintiffs are ordered to show cause why their claims against Defendant Patrick Lyman & 23 Associates LLC should not be dismissed with prejudice. In particular, if Plaintiffs wish to contest 24 dismissal of those claims they shall file a written response on or before October 15, 2013. 25 Plaintiffs are warned that if no written response is filed, the Court will dismiss the claims with 26 prejudice in accordance with the Notice of Settlement. 27

28

United States District Court Northern District of California

Dockets.Justia.com

1	IT IS SO ORDERED.	,
2	Dated: September 30, 2013	Jacq while S. Caly JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
3		JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
4		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24 25		
23 26		
20 27		
27		
20		
		2
		2

United States District Court Northern District of California