

13 Defendant's motion for partial summary judgment came on for hearing before this 14 court on January 15, 2014. Plaintiffs and counter-defendants XL Marketing Corp., et al. 15 ("plaintiffs") appeared through their counsel, Leeor Neta. Defendant and counter-plaintiff 16 Kristina Kirby ("defendant" or "Kirby") appeared through her counsel, Daniel Balsam. 17 Having read the papers filed in conjunction with the motion and carefully considered the 18 arguments and the relevant legal authority, and good cause appearing, the court DENIES 19 Kirby's motion for the reasons stated at the hearing. Kirby seeks a ruling regarding the 20 scope of federal CAN-SPAM preemption in the abstract, and presents no actual facts in her 21 motion. As such, the court finds that Kirby seeks an advisory opinion, and thus DENIES 22 her motion for partial summary judgment. The court also DENIES as moot plaintiffs' 23 "application to strike" Kirby's motion.

At the hearing, the court also noted that the jurisdictional basis for this case is
unclear, now that it is no longer consolidated with <u>Davison v. Riley</u>. Accordingly, the court
orders plaintiffs to show cause as to why this case should not be dismissed for lack of
subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiffs shall have until **January 29, 2014** to file a response to
this order, and Kirby shall have until **February 12, 2014** to respond to plaintiffs' filing.

1	Finally, to remove any doubt, this case shall remain stayed for all purposes other
2	than the OSC until the court rules otherwise.
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	Dated: January 15, 2014
5	PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON United States District Judge
6	Office Office District Oddge
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	