| 1 | | |
|----|---|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 6 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | VANCAMP SEATA VAI, et al., | No. C-13-0294 EMC |
| 9 | Plaintiffs, | ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE |
| 10 | v. | |
| 11 | WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., et al., | |
| 12 | Defendants. | (Docket No. 49) |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | Plaintiffs have filed a statement of nonopposition to Defendants Wells Fargo and Golden | |
| 16 | West's motion for summary judgment. Accordingly, the Court hereby GRANTS Wells Fargo and | |
| 17 | Golden West's motion and dismisses them with prejudice from the case. | |
| 18 | This leaves as the only remaining defendant in the case Cal-Western. In July 2013, Cal- | |
| 19 | Western filed a notice stating that it had filed a bankruptcy petition, and thus this litigation as to it | |
| 20 | should be stayed. See Docket No. 42 (notice). No party contested Cal-Western's position. | |
| 21 | However, it appears that that bankruptcy proceeding has now closed. | |
| 22 | Given the apparent closure of the bankruptcy case and Plaintiffs' concession that they have | |
| 23 | no viable claims against the main defendants in the case, the Court now orders Plaintiffs to show | |
| 24 | cause as to why any claims against Cal-Western should not be dismissed, either with or without | |
| 25 | prejudice. | |
| 26 | /// | |
| 27 | /// | |

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

Plaintiffs' response shall be filed within one week from the date of this order. Cal-Western may file a reply to the response within two weeks from the date of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 4, 2014

EDWARD M. CHEN United States District Judge