IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA FRANK L. CHOY, Plaintiff, v. GENERAL MOTORS LLC, Defendant.

Before the Court is defendant General Motors LLC's "Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for Failure to State a Claim," filed January 22, 2024, whereby defendant seeks dismissal of plaintiff Frank L. Choy's Fourth and Fifth Causes of Action. Plaintiff has not filed opposition.<sup>1</sup>

Having read and considered the papers filed in support of the motion, the Court deems the matter appropriate for determination thereon, VACATES the hearing scheduled for March 1, 2024, and hereby GRANTS the motion, as follows:

1. The Fourth Cause of Action, by which plaintiff asserts a claim of fraud, based
on the theory that defendant made false statements to plaintiff or, alternatively, made
statements as to which it omitted material information, is hereby DISMISSED. Rule 9(b)
of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires a party alleging fraud to "state with
particularity the circumstances constituting fraud," <u>see</u> Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b), including "the
time, place, and specific content of the false representations," <u>see Swartz v. KPMG LLP</u>,

26

United States District Court Northern District of California 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Under the Local Rules of this District, any opposition was due no later than
February 5, 2024. See Civil L.R. 7-3(a) (providing opposition to motion "must be filed and served not more than 14 days after the motion was filed").

**Northern District of California** United States District Court

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

476 F.3d 756, 764 (9th Cir. 2007). Plaintiff, however, fails to allege when and where he 2 heard any of the statements on which he relied, and, with the exception of one statement 3 (see Compl. ¶ 24), plaintiff does not allege the specific content of the statements on 4 which he assertedly relied, and, at best, alleges paraphrased statements, see Wenger v. 5 Lumisys, Inc., 2 Fed. Supp. 2nd 1231, 1246-47 (N.D. Cal. 1998) (holding allegations "paraphras[ing]" statements asserted to be fraudulent "lack[] the specificity required by 6 7 Rule 9(b)" (citing cases)).

2. The Fifth Cause of Action, by which plaintiff asserts violations of § 17200 of the Business & Professions Code, is hereby DISMISSED. The Fifth Cause of Action is based on the alleged false statements and omissions on which the Fourth Cause of Action is based (see Compl. ¶¶ 106-07, 117, 120, 124, 131), and, for the reasons stated above with respect to the Fourth Cause of Action, is not pleaded in conformity with Rule 9(b).

3. Should plaintiff wish to amend for purposes of curing the deficiencies identified above, plaintiff shall file a First Amended Complaint no later than March 9, 2024. If plaintiff does not file a First Amended Complaint by said deadline, the above-titled action will proceed on the First, Second, and Third Causes of Action asserted in the initial complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 22, 2024

States District Judge

2