

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

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM E. HAMMONS,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [15-cv-04897-RS](#)

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH  
PREJUDICE**

In this action, borrowers William E. Hammons and Gwendolyn M. Bridges raise a host of state law violations stemming from the foreclosure sale of their home. Defendants Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (“Wells Fargo”) and NDeX West, LLC (“NDeX”) moved to dismiss the original complaint on October 30, 2015. Dkt. No. 6. That motion was granted with leave to amend on December 18, 2015. Dkt. No. 12. The first amended complaint (“FAC”) was filed on January 19, 2016, and defendants moved to dismiss for a second time two weeks later. Dkt. Nos. 17–18. The motion to dismiss the FAC was granted with leave to amend on March 4, 2016. Dkt. No. 25. The order dismissing the FAC held any amended complaint must include factual allegations sufficient to support the reasonable inference that Wells Fargo did not acquire plaintiffs’ loan through its merger with World Savings. It also directed plaintiffs to file an amended pleading within thirty days of the date of the order, provided they could do so in good faith. The deadline for filing a second amended complaint has now come and gone (and then some). As plaintiffs have not filed an amended pleading, this action is dismissed with prejudice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

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

Dated: April 6, 2016



RICHARD SEEBORG  
United States District Judge