UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

REZN8 SYSTEMS, INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

No. C 10-1799 PJH

٧.

ORDER

EDMUND BROWN, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiffs filed the complaint in the above-entitled action on April 27, 2010, and also filed an application for a temporary restraining order ("TRO") and a request for an order to show cause re preliminary injunction. On May 12, 2010, the court denied the application for the TRO and the request for the order to show cause. Also on May 12, 2010, plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal of the order denying the TRO application. On May 19, 2010, the Ninth Circuit issued an order directing plaintiffs to voluntarily dismiss the appeal or show cause why it should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

On May 25, 2010, defendants filed a motion with this court, seeking an order dismissing the complaint. The motion is presently noticed for hearing on June 30, 2010. Plaintiffs' opposition to the motion was due on June 9, 2010. Rather than filing an opposition to defendants' motion, however, plaintiffs filed a first amended complaint on June 11, 2010. Defendants' reply to the opposition was due on June 16, 2010, but none was filed.

The court has not reviewed defendants' motion, and thus makes no finding as to

whether the first amended complaint resolves the issues raised by defendants. The court finds, however, that the interests of judicial economy will be better served if defendants immediately withdraw the motion, and respond instead to the first amended complaint, by filing responsive pleadings or motions to dismiss no later than 14 days after the Ninth Circuit determines whether it has subject matter jurisdiction to consider plaintiffs' appeal of the order denying the TRO application.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 17, 2010

United States District Judge