

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARK ADAMS,

No. C 12-01854 DMR

Plaintiff(s),

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO DISMISS**

v.

VIVO INC,

Defendant(s).
_____ /

On May 4, 2012, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint. [Docket Nos. 6, 14.] Plaintiff's opposition or statement of non-opposition was due on May 18, 2005. *See* N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 7-3. Plaintiff, who is proceeding *pro se*, made no filings. On June 4, 2012, the court ordered Plaintiff to show cause by June 15, 2012 as to why he failed to respond to Defendants' motion. The court also ordered Plaintiff to simultaneously "(1) submit his opposition to the court with a request for leave to file a late opposition, or (2) file a statement of non-opposition to the motion." [Docket No. 17.]

On June 15, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file an opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss. [Docket No. 23.] He did not attach his proposed opposition as the court ordered. In his motion, Plaintiff asserts that he did not timely file his opposition because the courtroom deputy should have advised him of the deadlines set forth in the Court's Local Rules. This is incorrect. All litigants, even those proceeding without counsel, are expected to review the Rules.

1 The court directs Plaintiff to The Court's *Pro Se* Handbook, which he can find under the Quick Link
2 "If You Don't Have a Lawyer" on the Court's webpage at www.cand.uscourts.gov.

3 Plaintiff is directed to file an opposition to Defendants' motion by July 3, 2012 and to ensure
4 that Defendants receive it that same day. Defendants' reply is due July 12, 2012, and the hearing
5 will proceed as scheduled on July 26, 2012. Plaintiff's motion for leave is denied as moot and the
6 accompanying June 28, 2012 hearing vacated.

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9
10 Dated: June 26, 2012

