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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

San Francisco Division

DIAMOND REAL ESTATE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AMERICAN BROKERS CONDUIT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-03937-LB

ORDER REGARDING 1) CONSENT OR BEFORE A MAGISTRATE JUDGE, 2) SERVICE, AND 3) BRIEFING **SCHEDULE**

There are three outstanding issues: 1) the issue of consent or declination, 2) the issue of service on American Brokers Conduit, and 3) the plaintiffs' opposition to the pending motion to dismiss.

1. Consent or Declination

This case was assigned under General Order 44 to Magistrate Judge Laurel Beeler to conduct all proceedings and to order the entry of final judgment upon the consent of all parties. There is a pending motion to dismiss. (See ECF No. 7.) The court cannot rule on the motion unless all parties file a signed consent. The court asks the plaintiffs to file and signed the attached "Consent or Declination to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction" by August 10, 2016. The plaintiffs are free to withhold consent without substantive consequences. If parties do not consent, the case will be randomly assigned to a district judge. There is a description of consenting to or declining magistrate-judge jurisdiction on pages 14 and 15 (Chapter 6) of the handbook that the court sent to

the plaintiffs. All parties must make that choice by filling out the attached form and either consent to or decline magistrate-judge jurisdiction.

2. Status of American Brokers Conduit

The only defendant who has not appeared is American Brokers Conduit. The defendants' counsel filed an update saying that his internet researched revealed that the company filed for bankruptcy in 2010 and went out of business. (See ECF No. 15.) When the plaintiffs submit their consent/declination form, the court asks them to submit an update on whether they served or intend to serve American Brokers Conduit. The court advises the plaintiffs that they can dismiss that defendant without prejudice. Also, generally, if a plaintiff does not serve a defendant in 90 days, and does not establish good cause for failing to do so, the court can dismiss that defendant from the case without prejudice. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

3. Briefing Schedule

The plaintiffs' opposition to the motion to dismiss was due on August 3, 2016. The court did not receive a copy. The court extends the deadline to file an opposition until August 10, 2016.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 4, 2016

United States Magistrate Judge

| 1 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 2 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 3 | SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION | |
| 4 | DIAMOND REAL ESTATE, et al., | Core No. 16 ov 02027 LD |
| 5 | Plaintiffs. | Case No. 16-cv-03937-LB |
| 6 | v. | CONSENT OR DECLINATION |
| 7 | AMERICAN BROKERS CONDUIT, et al., | TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE JURISDICTION |
| 8 | Defendants. | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate below by checking one of the two boxes whether you (if you are the party or the party you represent (if you are an attorney in the case) choose(s) to consent or decline magistrate judgi jurisdiction in this matter. Sign this form below your selection. | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | () <u>Consent</u> to Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), I voluntarily <u>consent</u> to have a United States magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings in this case, including trial and entry of final judgment. I understand that appeal from the judgment shall be taken directly to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | OR | |
| 16 | () <u>Decline</u> Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), I <u>decline</u> to have a United States magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings in this case and I hereby request that this case be | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | reassigned to a United States district judge. | NAME. |
| 19 | DATE: | NAME: JNSEL FOR |
| 20 | | "PRO SE"): |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | Signature | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DIAMOND REAL ESTATE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

AMERICAN BROKERS CONDUIT, et al., Defendants.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Case No. 3:16-cv-03937-LB

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on August 4, 2016, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Diamond Real Estate 28470 Rochelle Ave Hayward, CA 94544-5452

Editha Palancia 28470 Rochelle Ave. Hayward, CA 94544-5452

Porfirio P. Jorque 28470 Rochelle Ave Hayward, CA 94544-5452

Dated: August 4, 2016

Susan Y. Soong Clerk, United States District Court

Lashanda Scott, Deputy Clerk to the Honorable LAUREL BEELER

4

24

25

26

27 28