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

United States District Court Northern District of California

OLUCHI NNACHI,

Plaintiff,

v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,

Defendant.

Case No.: 4:13-cv-05582-KAW

ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO FILE OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS BY NO LATER THAN JULY 23, 2014

Plaintiff Oluchi Nnachi proceeds *pro se* in the above-captioned case. On June 13, 2014 the City and County of San Francisco ("Defendant") filed a motion to dismiss. The motion is set for hearing on August 7, 2014.

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-3, Plaintiff's opposition was due on June 30, 2014. On July 2, 2014, Defendant filed a notice indicating that as of July 2, 2014, Plaintiff had not filed an opposition to the pending motion to dismiss. (Def.'s Notice, Dkt. No. 33.) On that basis, Defendant requested that the motion be granted as unopposed. (*Id.*)

On July 7, 2014, Plaintiff filed a document captioned "Opposition to Defendant,s [sic] City & County of San Francisco Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff,s [sic] Second Amended Complaint." (Pl.'s Opp'n, Dkt. No. 34.) In the filing, Plaintiff indicates that he did not receive a copy of the motion to dismiss and instead first learned about the motion when Defendant filed its July 2, 2014 notice. (*Id.* at 2.) Plaintiff states that "[i]t is possible the defendant mailed the motion to [his] address, but something went wrong in the delivery system that [he] cannot control." (*Id.*)

Plaintiff also indicates that in the parties' joint case management conference statement, he "made it clear that [he] will oppose any future memorandum from the defendant to the court to

United States District Court Northern District of California dismiss this case" and that "[b]ecause [they] have already in good faith exchanged what each party intends to do in the joint case management conference of 05/13/14, the motion to dismiss should be denied and plaintiff be given time by the court to oppose the motion in another forum if allowed by the court." (*Id.*) He adds that he does "not think the defendant will suffer any prejudive [*sic*] by re-issuing the motion again" (*Id.*)

The certificate of service Defendant filed in connection with its motion to dismiss shows that the motion papers were mailed to Plaintiff's address of record. (Certificate of Service, Dkt. No. 30.) To the extent that Plaintiff claims that he did not receive a copy of the motion papers due to an issue outside of his control, Plaintiff is on notice that he is responsible for taking whatever steps are necessary to ensure that he has a reliable address where he can receive filings in this case. To avoid any future issues with his mail service, Plaintiff may also request permission to file and receive court papers electronically as set forth in Civil Local Rule 5-1(b) (a pro se party may file and receive court papers electronically after filing a motion, and being granted, permission to do so). If Plaintiff still has not received a copy of Defendants' moving papers, he may review a copy at the Clerk's Office for a fee, as permitted by Civil Local Rule 5-1(c)(5)(B) ("Any person may review at the Clerk's Office all filings, electronic or paper, that have not been sealed by the Court.").

Notwithstanding any joint case management conference statement that has been filed in this case, if Plaintiff wishes to oppose the pending motion to dismiss, Plaintiff shall file an opposition to the motion by no later than July 23, 2014. If Plaintiff does not file an opposition, the Court may grant the motion as unopposed. *See* Judge Westmore's General Standing Order ¶ 21 ("The failure of the opposing party to file a memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to any motion shall constitute consent to the granting of the motion"). The August 7, 2014 hearing on the motion is hereby VACATED.

If Plaintiff requires assistance with preparing his opposition to the motion to dismiss, he may wish to consult a manual the court has adopted to assist *pro se* litigants in presenting their case. This manual, and other free information, is available online at: http://cand.uscourts.gov/

United States District Court Northern District of California

proselitigants.	Plaintiff may also wish to contact the Federal Pro Bono Project's Help Desk—
free service for	pro se litigants—by calling (415) 782-8982.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 9, 2014

KANDIS A. WEJ FAIORE United States Magistrate Judge