

United States District Court
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

APRIL COYLE,

No. C 16-05674 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

EXPERIAN INFORMATION
SOLUTIONS, INC., *et al.*,


**ORDER DENYING PRO
HAC VICE APPLICATION**

Defendants.

The *pro hac vice* application of Attorney Andrew Soukup (Dkt. No. 31) is **DENIED** for failing to comply with Local Rule 11-3. That rule requires an applicant to certify that “he or she is an active member in good standing of the bar of a United States *Court* or of the highest *court* of another State or the District of Columbia, *specifying such bar*” (emphasis added). Filling out the *pro hac vice* form from the district court website such that it identifies only the state of bar membership — *e.g.*, “the bar of the District of Columbia” — is inadequate under the rule because it fails to identify a specific court. While the application fee does not need to be paid again, the application cannot be processed until a corrected form is submitted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 30, 2016.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE