

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

DANIEL E. LEVY,
Plaintiff,
v.
PREVACUS, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [4:16-cv-01555-KAW](#)

**ORDER DENYING APPLICATION FOR
ADMISSION OF ATTORNEY PRO HAC
VICE; ORDER REGARDING PENDING
MOTIONS TO DISMISS**

Re: Dkt. No. 41

On March 27, 2017, attorney Matthew W. Bennett filed an application for admission *pro hac vice*, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 11-3, so that he may represent corporate defendant Prevacus, Inc. (Dkt. No. 41.)

Mr. Bennett, however, did not attach “a true and correct copy of a certificate of good standing or other similar official document issued by the appropriate authority governing attorney admissions for the relevant bar.” Civil L.R. 11-3(a). Instead, he attached a print out from the Florida State Bar’s website. This is insufficient. Moreover, Mr. Bennett did not engage local counsel, which is also required for admission. Civil L.R. 11-3(a)(3) (“That an attorney, identified by name and office address, who is a member of the bar of this Court in good standing and who maintains an office within the State of California, is designated as co-counsel.”). Accordingly, Mr. Bennett’s application for admission *pro hac vice* is DENIED.

///
///
///
///
///

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

Furthermore, since Prevacus, Inc. cannot appear pro se, and is not currently represented by an attorney authorized to practice law in the Northern District of California, it cannot join in the pending motions to dismiss. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 42 & 43.) Therefore, the Court will consider the pending motions brought solely on behalf of Plaintiff Jake VanLandingham.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 10, 2017


KANDIS A. WESTMORE
United States Magistrate Judge