1		
1		
2		
3		
4 5		
6		
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8		
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	MINNY FRANK,	No. C 13-0089 MMC
12	Plaintiff, v.	ORDER CONSTRUING PLAINTIFF'S NON-OPPOSITION AS REQUEST FOR
13	COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT, et al.,	DISMISSAL; DISMISSING CLAIMS AGAINST DEFENDANTS DAVID AND
14	Defendant.	JENNIFER WILLIAMS; DENYING AS MOOT DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
15		DISMISS AND PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
16		
17	On May 26, 2014, plaintiff Minny Frank filed a "Motion for Partial Summary	
18	Judgment Against Defendants David and Jennifer Williams." On June 9, 2014, said	
19	defendants filed a "Motion to Dismiss," which the Court construes as an opposition to	
20	plaintiff's motion. Thereafter, on June 16, 2014, plaintiff filed a document titled "Non	
21	Opposition Response to Defendants David and Jennifer Williams Motion to Dismiss," in	
22	which plaintiff states, in full:	
23	Plaintiff mindful that Defendants and Plaintiff are in pro per, Plaintiff has no opposition to the motion, however, and not otherwise adopting that the Second	
24	Amended Complaint would have been futile. Said Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court Grant the Defendants['] Request as to all causes of action against the	
25	Defendants David and Jennifer Williams in this Complaint.	
26	(<u>See</u> Non Opposition Response at 1-2.)	
27	Having read and considered plaintiff's June 16, 2014 response, the Court construes	
28	such filing as a request for voluntary dismissal pursuant to Rule 41(a)(2) of the Federal	
	Rules of Civil Procedure.	

For the Northern District of California

Dockets.Justia.com

Accordingly, plaintiff's claims against defendants David Williams and Jennifer	
Williams are hereby DISMISSED.	
In light of such dismissal, said defendants' motion to dismiss and plaintiff's motion	
for summary judgment are hereby DENIED as moot.	
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
Dated: June 18, 2014	
Dated: June 18, 2014	
United States District Judge	
2	