

For the Northern District of California

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  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

PEDRO DECTOR and FLORIBERTO  
PEREZ OJEDA and all others similarly  
situated,

No. 13-00104 RS

Plaintiffs,

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

v.

CITY OF ROHNERT PARK, ROHNERT  
PARK DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC  
SAFETY and DOES 1-5, inclusive,

Defendants.

Plaintiffs filed this class action on January 8, 2013. Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint, alleging a federal procedural due process claim in addition to various state law claims, was dismissed with leave to amend on July 22, 2013. *See* Dkt. No. 28. On August 9, 2013, plaintiffs notified the Court that they have elected not to amend their complaint further to state a viable federal claim. Federal courts generally decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims when no federal claim is asserted. *See Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 351 (1988) (“[I]n the usual case in which all federal-law claims are eliminated before trial, the balance of factors to be considered under the pendent jurisdiction

1 doctrine-judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity-will point toward declining to  
2 exercise jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims.”). Plaintiffs are thus directed to show  
3 cause as to why this Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over their state law claims  
4 no later than **September 26, 2013**. Failure to so demonstrate shall result in the dismissal of this  
5 matter without further notice.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7  
8 Dated: 8/12/13



9 RICHARD SEEBORG  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28