

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
28IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

COURTNEY LAWSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

DARIUS (DEREK) CHABROWSKI,

Defendant.

No. C 13-01130 WHA

**NOTICE RE RECENT
FILINGS BY DEFENDANT**

Plaintiff timely filed a motion to remand this action on March 21, 2013 (Dkt. No. 3). Defendant failed to respond. Defendant was ordered to show cause by April 23 why the action should not be remanded, and failed to respond (Dkt. No. 19). He was given until April 30 to answer or otherwise respond to the complaint, which he also failed to do (*ibid.*). By order dated May 2, this action was remanded to the Superior Court for the County of San Mateo (Dkt. No. 20). That order found that defendant improperly removed this action. Defendant was given ample notice of the motion to remand and was provided lenience regarding due dates to respond, but chose not to do so.

After the order remanding this action was entered, defendant filed a motion to strike plaintiff's motion to remand, a motion for a "more definitive statement," a motion to consolidate the case with *Chabrowski v. Lawson*, No. C 12-6339 (which has been dismissed by Judge Richard Seeborg), and a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) or 12(b)(6) (Dkt. Nos. 22–24). The May 2 order divested this Court of jurisdiction over this matter.

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

Seedman v. U.S. Dist. Court for Cent. Dist. of Cal., 837 F.2d 413, 414 (9th Cir. 1988).

Defendant's recently filed motions are **DENIED AS MOOT**.

Defendant is on notice that no further filings are to be made with this Court.

Defendant should proceed to litigate the merits of this action in the Superior Court for the County of San Mateo.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 14, 2013.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE